

Moving to Work Annual Report

Fiscal Year 2014

July 1, 2013 – June 30, 2014

Submitted to HUD on June 12, 2015



Page left blank intentionally.

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	General Housing Authority Operating Information.....	10
III.	Proposed MTW Activities.....	22
IV.	Approved MTW Activities.....	23
V.	Sources and Uses of Funds.....	77
VI.	Administrative.....	79

Page left blank intentionally.

I. Introduction

Generally, Public Housing Agencies will include short-term and long-term Moving to Work program goals and objectives in this section. Agencies include information about whether short-term goals and objectives were accomplished during the fiscal year and report progress towards long-term goals and objectives.

The Louisville Metro Housing Authority (LMHA), formerly known as the Housing Authority of Louisville, is a nonprofit agency responsible for the development and management of federally assisted housing in the Louisville Metro area. In 2003, Louisville Metro Mayor Jerry Abramson and the Louisville Metro Council approved the merger of the Housing Authority of Louisville and Housing Authority of Jefferson County, thereby creating the Louisville Metro Housing Authority. A nine-member Board of Commissioners, appointed by the Metro Mayor, serves as the policy making body of the agency.

At FYE 2014, LMHA managed over 3,500 units in two family housing communities, five housing communities for disabled and senior citizens, and a growing number of scattered site properties. Additionally, the Agency administered public housing assistance for 863 public housing units located at mixed-income and mixed-finance sites that are privately owned and managed, and it administered rental assistance to 8,411 families under its leased housing program. As of June 30, 2014, LMHA provided housing assistance to more than 12,700 units in the combined public housing and leased housing programs.

Funding for the agency's operation comes from rental income and annual operating subsidy from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). The agency also receives Capital Improvement funds on an annual basis from HUD. Periodically, the agency also applies for funds from HUD and the City's Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program to finance various modernization improvements.

Moving To Work Demonstration Program

Louisville Metro Housing Authority, then the Housing Authority of Louisville, became one of a small group of public housing agencies participating in the Moving to Work (MTW) Demonstration Program in 1999. The MTW program authorized by Congress and signed into Law as part of the Omnibus Consolidated Rescissions and Appropriations Act of 1996, offers public housing agencies (PHAs) the opportunity to design and test innovative, locally-designed housing and self-sufficiency strategies for low-income families. The program allows exemptions from existing low-income public housing (Section 9) and Section 8 rules, and it permits LMHA to combine public housing operating, capital, and rental assistance funds into a single agency-wide funding source.

Under the MTW program, LMHA creates and adopts an annual Moving to Work plan that describes new and ongoing activities that utilize authority granted to LMHA under the MTW Agreement. This plan focuses primarily on the Public Housing, Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) and Capital Fund programs, as these are the LMHA programs that fall under MTW. The annual plan also focuses on newly proposed MTW activities and MTW activities that are ongoing. In addition, it contains a limited amount of information about LMHA's non-MTW initiatives such as public housing site improvements and resident self-sufficiency programs. The MTW Annual Report - prepared at the end of the fiscal year (FY) - is an update on the status and outcomes of those activities included in the MTW Annual Plan.

MTW Objectives

Moving to Work is a demonstration program that allows PHAs to design and test ways to achieve three statutory goals. Each one of LMHA's MTW activities must achieve at least one of these statutory objectives:

- Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures;
- Give incentives to residents, especially families with children, to obtain employment and become economically self-sufficient; and
- Increase housing choices for low-income families.

At the inception of LMHA's status as a Moving to Work agency, LMHA carefully evaluated its own goals and objectives against those of the demonstration. The outcome was six long-term goals for LMHA's participation in the MTW program.

Locally Defined LMHA MTW Goals

These goals, as outlined in the FY 1999 MTW Annual Plan, are locally-driven refinements of HUD's objectives:

- Increase the share of residents moving toward self-sufficiency;
- Achieve a greater income mix at LMHA properties;
- Expand the spatial dispersal of assisted housing;
- Improve the quality of the assisted housing stock;
- Reduce and/or reallocate administrative, operational and/or maintenance costs; and
- Enhance the Housing Authority's capacity to plan and deliver effective programs.

Since that time LMHA has recognized a growing number of populations with specific needs that often go unmet by existing housing and support service infrastructure. The Agency has revised and updated its goals to reflect changes in the local community and the evolution of the HUD MTW demonstration into a performance-driven program. In addition to the goals above, LMHA has set the goal to:

- Develop programs and housing stock targeted to populations with special needs, especially those families not adequately served elsewhere in the community.

Proposed and Ongoing Moving To Work Activities

MTW Activities Proposed in FY 2014 Plan

An MTW activity is defined as any activity LMHA engages in that requires MTW flexibility to waive statutory or regulatory requirements. In the FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan, LMHA proposed three **new** MTW activities that were subsequently approved by HUD:

- An agreement with Frazier Rehab Institute to allow them to sublease two fully-accessible units at Liberty Green Community Center to low-income families enrolled in their Spinal Cord Injury outpatient rehabilitation program (37-2014). This activity was originally proposed in the 2013

MTW Annual Plan; however, it was determined that LMHA would need Use of MTW Funds authority (which the agency did not yet have at the time). In FY 2014, HUD granted LMHA Use of Funds authority, and subsequently the activity was included and approved in the FY 2014 Annual MTW Plan Amendment.

- A 2% cap on annual HCV contract rent increases (39-2014); and
- A financial aid deduction for all households, regardless of age (40-2014).

In addition, LMHA proposed an activity in 2014 that HUD **did not** approve:

- Special occupancy requirements (elderly-only) for a portion of units at Building C at Dosker Manor (41-2014). HUD determined that LMHA should apply for these requirements through HUD's established designation process.

Finally, LMHA received HUD authorization to significantly amend two previously approved MTW activities:

- As part of the two-year recertification activity, create a local Privacy Authorization form that is valid for 24 months (4-2007); and
- As part of the education / employment requirements for residency in one of the detached, single-family scattered site units, define "Work" as employment of at least 2,000 hours annually at a rate of pay at \$7.25/hour (9-2007).

Ongoing MTW Activities

LMHA had a variety of MTW activities that were ongoing in FY 2014:

- Special referral Housing Choice Voucher programs with several local service providers. These programs tie voucher assistance to supportive services for populations with specific needs not met elsewhere in the community. LMHA provide rental assistance to families at Center for Women and Families and Family Scholar House while they live onsite and portable vouchers upon graduation (1-2005, 15-2009, 20-2010, 31-2012, 38-2013); A Special Referral HCV program with the 100,000 Homes Initiative (31-2012);
- Authority to allocate MTW Housing Choice Vouchers to special referral programs with service-enriched housing providers (35-2012);
- An initiative that detaches Section 8 homeownership payment standards from traditional HCV payment standards (3-2006);
- A two-year recertification process of elderly families and all families whose head of household or cohead is disabled (4-2007). In FY 2014, LMHA amended this activity to include creation of a local Privacy Authorization form that allows 24 months between re-verifications;
- An earned income disregard for elderly families in the HCV program (6-2008);
- A standard medical deduction for all elderly and disabled families in the Public Housing and HCV programs (8-2008);

- Term limits and Education/Work requirements for highly desirable New Scattered-Site single-family units (9-2009). In 2010, LMHA added mandatory case management for residents at these homes (21-2010), and in FY 2014, as part of the Education/Work requirements, LMHA used MTW authority to define work as employment of at least 2,000 hours annually at a rate of pay at least equal to \$7.25/hour (9-2007). In 2010, LMHA added mandatory case management for residents at these homes (21-2010);
- A local definition of elderly as families whose head of household or cohead is age 55 or over at LMHA's elderly and disabled high-rises (10-2008);
- An exception payment standard for the HCV Homeownership program (13-2009);
- A flexible third-party verification policy for the HCV Homeownership program (11-2009);
- Simplification of the public housing development submittal (18-2009);
- Lease-up incentives for new residents at Dosker Manor as part of an effort to improve occupancy rates at the development (23-2010);
- Authority to acquire properties for public housing without prior HUD approval to expedite acquisition of units in mixed-income communities (26-2011);
- Amendment of the HCV admissions policy to allow for deduction of child-care expenses in determination of eligibility (27-2011);
- Elimination of the mandatory Earned Income Disregard (EID) (32-2012);
- A local preference to provide voucher assistance to persons referred by Day Spring, a program that offers adults with intellectual disabilities support services in a residential setting (7-2008); A local preference to provide voucher assistance to persons referred by Wellspring with developmental disabilities who wish to live independently at its Youngland facility (34-2012) and the Bashford Manor facility (36-2013); and

MTW Activities Not Yet Implemented

LMHA has one MTW activity that was previously proposed and approved, but has not been implemented yet.

- Locally Defined Guidelines for Development, Maintenance and Modernization of Public Housing (28-2011).

MTW Activities On Hold

LMHA has one MTW activity that was previously implemented, that the agency has stopped implementing, but that the Housing Authority plans to reactivate in the future.

- An agreement with Catholic Charities for emergency temporary housing for victims of human trafficking (25-2010).

Closed Out MTW Activities

Finally, LMHA has closed out five initiatives. The closed out initiatives are:

- Limiting the concentration of HCV assisted units in complexes of one hundred or more units to 25% (excluded both elderly/disabled and special referral program sites) (5-2007);
- Streamlined demolition and disposition application process for MTW Agencies (16-2009);
- Increased flat rents at New Scattered Sites (24-2010); and
- A Public Housing rent policy to set rent payments at 30% of adjusted annual income (33-2012).

Initiatives Using Single-Fund Budget Authority Only

The initiatives that use single-fund budget authority only are:

- Homeownership Maintenance Specialist (*not yet implemented*) (12-2009);
- Multicultural Family Assistance Program (*ongoing*) (17-2009);
- HCV Homeownership Weatherization and Energy Efficiency Pilot (*closed out*) (19-2010); and
- Avenue Plaza CFL Trade-in Program (*closed out*) (22-2010).

Moving to Work (MTW) Activity Matrix

#	Fiscal Year	MTW Activity	Status
41	2014	Special Occupancy Requirements for Floors 1-9 of Building C at Dosker Manor	Proposed, Not Approved
40	2014	Financial Aid Disregard in Calculation of TTP – HCV Program	Approved, Not Yet Implemented
39	2014	MTW Section 8 Rent Increase Limit	Ongoing
38	2013	Special Referral HCV Program – Parkland Scholar House	Ongoing
37	2013, 2014	Public Housing Sublease Agreement with Frazier Spinal Cord Rehab Institute	Ongoing
36	2013	Special Referral MTW HCV Program and Local Preference – Wellspring at Bashford Manor/Newburg	Ongoing
35	2012	Allocate MTW Housing Choice Vouchers to Special Referral Programs	Ongoing
34	2012	Special Referral MTW HCV Program and Local Preference – Wellspring at Youngland Avenue	Ongoing
33	2012	Rents Set at 30% of Adjusted Income - Public Housing Program	Closed Out
32	2012	Elimination of the Earned Income Disregard	Ongoing
31	2012	Special Referral HCV Program - Stoddard Johnston Scholar House	Ongoing
30	2012	Special Referral HCV Program – 100,000 Homes Initiative	Ongoing
29	2011	Public Housing Sublease Agreement with YouthBuild Louisville	Ongoing
28	2011	Locally Defined Guidelines for Development, Maintenance and Modernization of Public Housing	Not Yet Implemented
27	2011	Amend Public Housing and HCV Program Admissions Policy to Allow for Deduction of Child-Care Expenses in Determination of Eligibility	Ongoing
26	2011	Acquisition of Mixed-Income Sites for Public Housing	Ongoing
25	2010	Public Housing Sublease Agreement with Catholic Charities	On-Hold
24	2010	Increased Flat Rents for New Scattered Sites	Closed Out
23	2010	Lease-up Incentives for New Residents at Dosker Manor	Ongoing
22	2010	CFL Trade-in Pilot Program for Avenue Plaza Residents	Single Budget Authority Only, Closed Out
21	2010	Occupancy Criteria Changes for New Scattered Sites - Mandatory Case Management	Ongoing
20	2010	Special Referral HCV Program - Downtown Family Scholar House	Ongoing

Moving to Work (MTW) Activity Matrix Cont.

#	Fiscal Year	MTW Activity	Status
19	2010	Weatherization and Energy Efficiency Pilot and Section 8 Homeownership	Single Budget Authority Only, Closed Out
18	2009	Simplification of the Public Housing Development Submittal	Ongoing
17	2009	Multicultural Family Assistance Program	Single Budget Authority Only, Ongoing
16	2009	Streamlined Demolition and Disposition Application Process for MTW Agencies	Closed Out
15	2009	Special Referral HCV Program - Louisville Scholar House	Ongoing
14	2009	Center for Women and Families at the Villager - Determinations for Program Eligibility	Non-MTW
13	2009	HCV Homeownership Program – Exception Payment Standards	Ongoing
12	2009	Housing Choice Voucher Program Maintenance Specialist	Single Budget Authority Only, Not Yet Implemented
11	2009	HCV Homeownership - Flexibility in Third-Party Verifications	Ongoing
10	2008	Locally Defined Definition of Elderly	Ongoing
9	2007	Term Limits and Employment/Educational Work Requirements for New Scattered Sites; MTW Definition of Work (Revised FY 2014)	Ongoing
8	2008	Rent Simplification for Public Housing and Housing Choice Voucher Programs - Standard Medical Deduction	Ongoing
7	2008	Special Referral MTW HCV Program and Local Preference - Day Spring (Renewed 2012)	Ongoing
6	2008	Rent Simplification in the HCV Program - Earned Income Disregard for Elderly Families	Ongoing
5	2007	Spatial Deconstruction of HCV Assisted Units	Closed Out
4	2007	Rent Simplification for PH and HCV Programs - Alternate Year Reexaminations of Elderly and Disabled Families (Amended 2012, 2014)	Ongoing
3	2006	Amount and Distribution of Homeownership Assistance	Ongoing
2	1999	MTW Inspections Protocol	Ongoing
1	2005	Special Referral HCV Program - Center for Women and Families	Ongoing

Short and Long Term MTW Plan

The mission of the Louisville Metro Housing Authority is to provide quality, affordable housing for those in need, assist residents in their efforts to achieve financial independence, and work with the community to strengthen neighborhoods. In implementing this mission, LMHA will focus on the following short and long term goals.

During the fiscal year, LMHA focused on implementing its 2014 MTW Annual Plan. Key outcomes and accomplishments are summarized below.

- Executed an agreement that allows the Frazier Spinal Cord Rehabilitation program to sublease public housing units to low-income families while they are receiving treatment. 5 families were served through this activity during FY 2014;
- Imposed a 2% cap on Section 8 rent increases, in an effort to contain rising costs;
- Continued to expand service-enriched housing choices for low-income families, including disabled families, homeless families, and families with children, through programs like Day Spring and Family Scholar House;
- Continued to reduce administrative costs, and streamline the recertification process for elderly and disabled families, through biennial recertifications;
- Continued to expand housing choices for working families with child care expenses;
- Took part in discussions about the HUD-sponsored Rent Reform Demonstration program. LMHA, along with Lexington, San Antonio and D.C., will participate. About 2,000 households will be enrolled at each site;
- Continued to promote household self-sufficiency through rent changes and supportive services tied to the single-family scattered site public housing units;
- Continued to incentivize HCV homebuyers to purchase in neighborhoods of opportunity by increasing exception rent payment standards to 120% of FMR and providing the 2 bedroom payment standard for 1 bedroom qualified families; and
- Continued to streamline inspections of assisted SRO units by conducting annual, concurrent inspections.

In the long term, LMHA will continue to focus on the following initiatives. Progress towards these goals, made in the last year, is described below.

Reposition and redevelop the conventional Public Housing stock

The physical stock of the remaining original family developments owned and managed by LMHA needs to be completely redeveloped. These sites – large, dense, urban and often isolated – need major renovation or replacement. LMHA’s goal is to transform these communities in the coming years, replacing the current public housing developments with mixed income communities, while at the same time providing replacement units so that the overall number of families served will not decrease. In the

elderly developments, modernization efforts will proceed with an eye toward appropriate and expanded service provision.

Increase housing choice through stronger rental communities and options, and expanded homeownership opportunities.

Homeownership is an important housing choice option for many low-income families, and is an appropriate program given the local market. LMHA's nationally recognized Housing Choice Voucher Homeownership Program is an affordable and secure way for LMHA families to achieve self-sufficiency. The Agency can boast that together more than 200 Public Housing residents and HCV program participants have purchased homes through the program. For the many other families for whom homeownership isn't a viable option, LMHA will look at its Public Housing communities to see what policy and program changes might strengthen those communities and make them better places to live.

Develop programs and housing stock targeted to populations with special needs not adequately served elsewhere in the community.

MTW allows LMHA to break from HUD established "norms" and therefore maximize the potential of locally available resources to develop programs for people with specific needs. The goal is to meet needs not met by other agencies and to partner with local organizations that have social services programs that need a housing support element. Some of these needs will be transitional; others are for programs that provide more long-term support, particularly for single parents with children where the parent is working or preparing for work by participating in educational programs and young people enrolled in job and college prep programs. Developing comprehensive initiatives in these areas will continue to require regulatory relief. In FY2014, LMHA submitted a successful application to HUD for Broader Use of MTW Funds authority, an Amendment to Attachment D of the Agency's MTW Standard Agreement with HUD. The Use of MTW Funds amendment gives LMHA the authority to use MTW funds for purposes other than those specified in Section 8 and Section 9 of the 1937 Housing Act, provided such uses are consistent with other requirements of the MTW statute and have been proposed in the Agency's Annual MTW Plan and approved by HUD.

Encourage program participant self-sufficiency

The MTW agreement allows LMHA to reinvent the FSS program to make it appropriate to local program participant needs. The Demonstration also allows LMHA to rethink other policies – like the rent policy for Clarksdale HOPE VI replacement scattered sites – to encourage families to work towards housing self-sufficiency.

II. General Housing Authority Operation Information

Generally, this section is a pre-formatted Microsoft Excel table provided by HUD for PHAs to report the required housing stock, leasing and waitlist information. HUD has asked PHAs to copy and paste the HUD provided Microsoft Excel tables into the body of this Section (II) in their Plan/Report. With the initial submittal of each Plan/Report to HUD, the PHA will also include the completed, separate Microsoft Excel file.

II.1. Plan.Housing Stock

Not applicable. This section pertains only to the MTW Plan.

II.2. Plan.Leasing

Not applicable. This section pertains only to the MTW Plan.

II.3. Plan.Wait List

Not applicable. This section pertains only to the MTW Plan.

II.4. Report.Housing Stock

II.4.Report.HousingStock									
A. MTW Report: Housing Stock Information									
New Housing Choice Vouchers that were Project-Based During the Fiscal Year									
Property Name	Anticipated Number of New Vouchers to be Project-Based *	Actual Number of New Vouchers that were Project- Based	Description of Project						
Property Name	0	0	N/A						
Property Name	0	0	N/A						
Property Name	0	0	N/A						
Property Name	0	0	N/A						
Anticipated Total Number of New Vouchers to be Project-Based *		Actual Total Number of New Vouchers that were Project- Based		Anticipated Total Number of Project-Based Vouchers Committed at the End of the Fiscal Year *			Anticipated Total Number of Project- Based Vouchers Leased Up or Issued to a Potential Tenant at the End of the Fiscal Year *		
0		0		0			0		
Actual Total Number of Project-Based Vouchers Committed at the End of the Fiscal Year		Actual Total Number of Project-Based Vouchers Leased Up or Issued to a Potential Tenant at the End of the Fiscal Year		0			0		
0		0		0			0		
* From the Plan									

Other Changes to the Housing Stock that Occurred During the Fiscal Year

Sheppard Square HOPE VI Revitalization: In 2010, LMHA was awarded a HOPE VI grant for the revitalization of Sheppard Square, a 326-unit family development. The revitalization effort, which includes a mix of market rate, tax-credit and ACC rental units, as well as homeownership opportunities, has occurred in a series of phases scheduled for completion by 2015. As of fiscal year end 6/30/14, the existing units had been demolished, and construction of the first phase (60 units) was complete and the units were occupied.

As with all redevelopment efforts subsequent to Park DuValle that result in a loss of public housing units, LMHA is committed to one-for-one replacement of the 326 units razed at Sheppard. In FY2012, LMHA received approval from HUD to acquire existing, scattered-site units to replace a portion of the units that were demolished at Sheppard Square. While efforts in FY 2014 and FY 2015 were primarily focused on-site, offsite acquisitions of replacement housing will begin in earnest in FY 2016. At FYE 2013, 21 replacement units had been acquired. No acquisitions were completed in FY 2014.

Stoddard Johnston: Stoddard Johnston is a Mixed-Finance initiative of Family Scholar House (FSH) and the Louisville Metro Housing Authority. LMHA intends to acquire 4 units of public housing at the site. This project did not close in FY 2014.

Wilart Arms (KY 1-22): Wilart Arms Apartments (formerly known as Hallmark Plaza Apartments) is a Mixed-Finance initiative of the Kentucky Housing Corporation (KHC), LMHA, the Housing Partnership, Inc. (HPI), and HUD'S Federal Housing Administration (FHA) "Office of Multifamily Housing" (Multifamily Housing). The property is a 66-unit multi-family complex located off Dixie Highway in the Shively community. In 2007, the owners of Wilart Arms were delinquent on their loan. Also, the building had fallen into severe disrepair, and had been placed on HUD's troubled Multifamily Assets listing. In an effort to prevent the property from going into foreclosure and to preserve the housing complex, including project based Section 8, KHC reached out to Multifamily Housing for a possible solution. The solution was modeled on the work of other jurisdictions where such properties had been disposed of to the local Public Housing Authorities. KHC's proposal – a cooperative effort among KHC, Louisville Metro Housing Authority (LMHA) and the Housing Partnership, Inc. – was approved by Multifamily Housing and closed on April 29, 2010 with all participants except for LMHA.

Under the approved proposal, Housing Partnership, Inc. would renovate the site, reduce the density (originally 100 units), and own and manage the property. LMHA would acquire the use of 15 units at the property through Mixed-Finance development. LMHA and Wilart Arms Apartments, LLLP (Owner) would enter into a Regulatory and Operating Agreement and a Declaration of Restrictive Covenants (Declaration of Trust) would be recorded in favor of HUD. With board approval, LMHA agreed to fund a \$1,016,678 Promissory Note, for which owner is obligated to house public housing eligible residents in 15 units (2 one-bedroom units, 10 two-bedroom units and 3 three-bedroom units). Two of the units are also be accessible to persons with hearing and/or visual impairments. Of the remaining 51 units at Wilart Arms, 11 units are under the Tax Credit Assistance Program and 40 units are under the Project Based Section 8 Program.

This project did not close in FY 2014.

KY 1-034 Scattered Sites: LMHA continued holding units off-line at the Friary, a historic structure that LMHA purchased several years ago and used as public housing. More recently, the site has been emptied because the structure is in need of a comprehensive rehabilitation. As of May 30, 2015, LMHA had procured a private developer to redevelop the site.

Russel Neighobrhood and Beecher Terrace: Late 2014 the Housing Authority applied for (and as of early 2015, had been awarded) a Choice Neighborhoods Planning Grant from HUD to support development of a comprehensive neighborhood transformation plan for the Russell Neighborhood and the Beecher Terrace public housing development. Other HUD subsidized housing in the neighborhood may be included as part of the application. If the grant is awarded, the effort will focus on directing resources to address the three core goals of HUD's Choice Neighborhood programs: housing, people, and neighborhoods. To achieve these goals, Russell Neighborhood residents and partners, including the Louisville Metro Housing Authority, who would be the lead applicant, would utilize up to \$425,000 in financial support provided by the planning grant to develop a comprehensive neighborhood Transformation Plan. This Plan would serve as the guiding document for directing the transformation of the Russell neighborhood and distressed HUD subsidized housing within those boundaries, including the public housing at Beecher Terrace. The duration of the planning grant and deadline for completion of the Transformation Plan is up to two years. Implementation of the Plan would be contingent on procuring and raising adequate funding.

Examples of the types of other changes can include but are not limited to units that are held off-line due to the relocation of residents, units that are off-line due to substantial rehabilitation and potential plans for acquiring units.

General Description of Actual Capital Fund Expenditures During the Plan Year

The following projects were either completed or underway during fiscal year 2014:

Scattered Sites KY1-034 and KY1-017

601 W. Breckinridge roof replacement
St. Martin basement renovation
Restore Noltemeyer fire damaged unit
CH6 units with hail damage
Roof replacement area E-1 and E-2

KY1-014 Avenue Plaza/550 Apartments

Avenue Plaza elevator lobby HVAC upgrade

KY1-012 Dosker Manor

Concrete balcony "A" building

KY1-003 Iroquois Homes

Selective site demolition, including asbestos abatement at gymnasium, maintenance office, and community center

KY1-002 Beecher Terrace

Baxter Center renovation

Other

Green Physical Needs Assessment

Overview of Other Housing Owned and/or Managed by the PHA at Fiscal Year End		
Housing Program *	Total Units	Overview of the Program
HPP I [Other]	36	The Louisville Metro Housing Authority Development Corp. (formerly Louisville Housing Services) developed affordable condominium homeownership, providing construction, financing and property management expertise. LMHADC (using LMHA staff) continues to manage the sites for each condominium regime.
HPP II [Other]	15	Same as above.
HPP III [Other]	20	Same as above.
Parkland Place [Other]	12	Same as above.
Total Other Housing Owned and/or Managed	83	
<p>* Select Housing Program from: Tax-Credit, State Funded, Locally Funded, Market-Rate, Non-MTW HUD Funded, Managing Developments for other non-MTW Public Housing Authorities, or Other.</p>		
If Other, please describe:		Most of the funding for the developments was in debt with local banks. Also, the developments were partially funded by City HOME Fund Loans at a reduced 3% rate, over 20 years ago.

II.5. Report.Leasing

II.5.Report.Leasing

B. MTW Report: Leasing Information

Actual Number of Households Served at the End of the Fiscal Year

Housing Program:	Number of Households Served*	
	Planned	Actual
Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Property-Based Assistance Programs **	2	1.21
Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Tenant-Based Assistance Programs **	0	0
Port-In Vouchers (not absorbed)	0	0
Total Projected and Actual Households Served	2	1.21

* Calculated by dividing the planned/actual number of unit months occupied/leased by 12.

** In instances when a Local, Non-Traditional program provides a certain subsidy level but does not specify a number of units/Households Served, the PHA should estimate the number of Households served.

Housing Program:	Unit Months Occupied/Leased****	
	Planned	Actual
Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Property-Based Assistance Programs ***	24	13.46
Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Tenant-Based Assistance Programs ***	0	0
Port-In Vouchers (not absorbed)	0	0
Total Projected and Annual Unit Months Occupied/Leased	24	13.46

The metrics for the Sublease Agreement with Frazier Rehab were not benchmarked on a "unit months occupied" basis. LMHA was considering what a snapshot of the occupancy rates might be after implementation of the activity, i.e., 2 occupied units, 2 households served.

*** In instances when a local, non-traditional program provides a certain subsidy level but does not specify a number of units/Households Served, the PHA should estimate the number of households served.

**** Unit Months Occupied/Leased is the total number of months the housing PHA has occupied/leased units, according to unit category during the year.

	Average Number of Households Served Per Month	Total Number of Households Served During the Year
Households Served through Local Non-Traditional Services Only	0	0

Reporting Compliance with Statutory MTW Requirements: 75% of Families Assisted are Very Low-Income

HUD will verify compliance with the statutory objective of “assuring that at least 75 percent of the families assisted by the Agency are very low-income families” is being achieved by examining public housing and Housing Choice Voucher family characteristics as submitted into the PIC or its successor system utilizing current resident data at the end of the agency's fiscal year. The PHA will provide information on local, non-traditional families provided with housing assistance at the end of the PHA fiscal year, not reported in PIC or its successor system, in the following format:

Fiscal Year:	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Total Number of Local, Non-Traditional MTW Households Assisted	0	0	0	1.21	X	X	X	X
Number of Local, Non-Traditional MTW Households with Incomes Below 50% of Area Median Income	0	0	0	1.21	X	X	X	X
Percentage of Local, Non-Traditional MTW Households with Incomes Below 50% of Area Median Income	0	0	0	100	X	X	X	X

Reporting Compliance with Statutory MTW Requirements: Maintain Comparable Mix

In order to demonstrate that the statutory objective of "maintaining a comparable mix of families (by family size) are served, as would have been provided had the amounts not been used under the demonstration" is being achieved, the PHA will provide information in the following formats:

Baseline for the Mix of Family Sizes Served

Family Size:	Occupied Number of Public Housing units by Household Size when PHA Entered MTW	Utilized Number of Section 8 Vouchers by Household Size when PHA Entered MTW	Non-MTW Adjustments to the Distribution of Household Sizes *	Baseline Number of Household Sizes to be Maintained	Baseline Percentages of Family Sizes to be Maintained
1 Person	2496	54	0	2550	54.89
2 Person	555	33	0	588	12.66
3 Person	689	32	0	721	15.52
4 Person	436	22	0	458	9.86
5 Person	158	20	0	178	3.83
6+ Person	137	14	0	151	3.25
Totals	4471	175	0	4646	100

Explanation for
Baseline Adjustments
to the Distribution of
Household Sizes
Utilized

"Occupied Number of Public Housing units by Household Size when PHA Entered MTW" and "Utilized Number of Section 8 Vouchers by Household Size when PHA Entered MTW" is from the Housing Authority of Louisville's Moving to Work Demonstration program application prepared in 1997.

It should be noted that in 2003, the Housing Authority of Louisville merged with the Housing Authority of Jefferson County to form the Louisville Metro Housing Authority. Though the agencies' Public Housing and Section 8 programs were also merged that year, demographic information (by family size) is not available for the families who were then residing in HAJC public housing or receiving HJAC Section 8 rent assistance.

HAL data was presented in the following categories: 1-2 people; 3-4 people; and 5+ people. For purposes of this report, the historic data was prorated, in order to conform with the categories above, based on the characteristics of the 2014 population of households served.

Mix of Family Sizes Served							
	1 Person	2 Person	3 Person	4 Person	5 Person	6+ Person	Totals
Baseline Percentages of Household Sizes to be Maintained **	54.89	12.66	15.52	9.86	3.83	3.25	100.01
Number of Households Served by Family Size this Fiscal Year ***	5470	2458	2354	1632	909	683	13506
Percentages of Households Served by Household Size this Fiscal Year ****	40.50	18.20	17.43	12.08	6.73	5.06	100.00
Percentage Change	-26%	44%	12%	23%	76%	56%	99
Justification and Explanation for Family Size Variations of Over 5% from the Baseline Percentages	Unlike with the MTW Baseline Project (HUD Notice PIH-2013-02), HUD has not fully articulated a methodology for monitoring and evaluating compliance with the MTW objective to serve the same mix of families by family size. LMHA will investigate changes to demographics, housing stock and policies that may explain the variations from the baseline percentages, as shown above.						
* “Non-MTW adjustments to the distribution of family sizes” are defined as factors that are outside the control of the PHA. Acceptable “non-MTW adjustments” include, but are not limited to, demographic changes in the community’s population. If the PHA includes non-MTW adjustments, HUD expects the explanations of the factors to be thorough and to include information substantiating the numbers used.							
** The numbers in this row will be the same numbers in the chart above listed under the column “Baseline percentages of family sizes to be maintained.”							
*** The methodology used to obtain these figures will be the same methodology used to determine the “Occupied number of Public Housing units by family size when PHA entered MTW” and “Utilized number of Section 8 Vouchers by family size when PHA entered MTW” in the table immediately above.							
**** The “Percentages of families served by family size this fiscal year” will reflect adjustments to the mix of families served that are directly due to decisions the PHA has made. HUD expects that in the course of the demonstration, PHAs will make decisions that may alter the number of families served.							

Description of any Issues Related to Leasing of Public Housing, Housing Choice Vouchers or Local, Non-Traditional Units and Solutions at Fiscal Year End	
Housing Program	Description of Leasing Issues and Solutions
MTW Public Housing Program	<p><u>Mixed-population high-rises:</u> LMHA had been experiencing lower than normal occupancy rates at many of its mixed-population high-rises, therefore LMHA used its MTW authority to reduce the age of "elderly" to age 55, in order to open up the sites to additional non-disabled families. As a result, rates at most of these sites have remained stable and consistently above 90% since the activity began (See Activity #10-2008). Due to ongoing issues with occupancy rates at Dosker Manor, the Authority will consider whether an official elderly and/or disabled-only designation of one or more buildings at the site is appropriate.</p> <p><u>Scattered Sites:</u> LMHA has also been experiencing higher than normal vacancy rates among its Public Housing Scattered Sites AMP KY 1-034, which contains units at The Friary. LMHA has selected a private developer to redevelop the site.</p>
MTW Housing Choice Voucher Program	<p>Additionally, LMHA has been experiencing lower than normal leasing rates in the Housing Choice Voucher Program. Strategies to increase the rates include: Absorbing incoming ports; Accepting New Families off waiting list; Accepting Homeless Veteran preference referrals, and; Accepting VASH and MTW Special Referrals. Also, LMHA is currently participating in the MTW Rent Reform and are in active lease up for the HUD Study. In addition, LMHA is actively hiring new staff members for vacant positions for Housing Specialists, Rental Assistance Monitors, and Housing Clerk Typists.</p>
N/A	N/A

Number of Households Transitioned To Self-Sufficiency by Fiscal Year End		
Activity Name/#	Number of Households Transitioned *	Agency Definition of Self Sufficiency
#9-2007 (Term Limits / Employment Requirements for Scattered Sites) & #21-2010 (Mandatory Case Management)	48	Self sufficiency is "the ability to obtain and maintain suitable employment."
Activity Name/#	Number of Households Transitioned *	Agency Definition of Self Sufficiency
Activity Name/#	Number of Households Transitioned *	Agency Definition of Self Sufficiency
Activity Name/#	Number of Households Transitioned *	Agency Definition of Self Sufficiency
Households Duplicated Across Activities/Definitions	0	* The number provided here should match the outcome reported where metric SS #8 is used.
ANNUAL TOTAL NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS TRANSITIONED TO SELF SUFFICIENCY	48	

II.6. Report.Wait List

II.6.Report.Leasing				
C. MTW Report: Wait List Information				
Wait List Information at Fiscal Year End				
Housing Program(s) *	Wait List Type **	Number of Households on Wait List	Wait List Open, Partially Open or Closed ***	Was the Wait List Opened During the Fiscal Year
Federal MTW Housing Choice Voucher Program	Community-Wide	17,548	Open	No
Federal MTW Public Housing (LMHA Owned and Managed)	Community-Wide	3861	Open	No
Federal MTW Public Housing (Third Party Owned and Managed)	Site-Based	840 ⁽¹⁾	Open	No
⁽¹⁾ Liberty Green Site-Based Wait List data only. Others not available at this time.				
* Select Housing Program : Federal MTW Public Housing Units; Federal MTW Housing Choice Voucher Program; Federal non-MTW Housing Choice Voucher Units; Tenant-Based Local, Non-Traditional MTW Housing Assistance Program; Project-Based Local, Non-Traditional MTW Housing Assistance Program; and Combined Tenant-Based and Project-Based Local, Non-Traditional MTW Housing Assistance Program.				
** Select Wait List Types: Community-Wide, Site-Based, Merged (Combined Public Housing or Voucher Wait List), Program Specific (Limited by HUD or Local PHA Rules to Certain Categories of Households which are Described in the Rules for Program Participation), None (If the Program is a New Wait List, Not an Existing Wait List), or Other (Please Provide a Brief Description of this Wait List Type).				

*** For Partially Open Wait Lists, provide a description of the populations for which the waiting list is open.

N/A	
N/A	
N/A	
If Local, Non-Traditional Program, please describe:	
N/A	
N/A	
N/A	
If Other Wait List Type, please describe:	
N/A	
N/A	
N/A	

If there are any changes to the organizational structure of the wait list or policy changes regarding the wait list, provide a narrative detailing these changes.

Public Housing Waiting Lists

LMHA made the wait list changes below to the Agency's Public Housing Admissions and Continued Occupancy Plan (ACOP):
 Added a new waiting list preference for 3-bedroom, scattered-site, single-family detached houses only, which will be available to applicant families in which all adult household members are working at least 20 hours per week or are full-time students (an exception is made for elderly and/or disabled adults). The LMHA will only exercise this preference will there are no families eligible for these units on the Housing Authority's internal Scattered Site Unit Referral List.

Added a waiting list preference for former Sheppard Square residents who were relocated by the LMHA as a result of the Housing Authority's HOPE VI Revitalization. This preference is for the revitalized Sheppard Square development only.

In June 2013, HUD published an updated definition of the term "homeless" in PIH Notice 2013-15, Guidance on Housing Individuals and Families Experiencing Homelessness Through the Public Housing and Housing Choice Voucher Programs. The LMHA has thus updated the definition of "Homeless" the Housing Authority uses to determine whether an applicant is eligible for the waiting list preference available to homeless applicants.

Also, LMHA established a new site-based waitlist at Sheppard Square. The wait list was created in anticipation of leasing the units that were created under the HOPE VI Revitalization. The site is operated/managed by a third party.

Housing Choice Voucher Wait List

Additionally, LMHA made the waitlist changes described below to its HCV Administrative Plan:
 Updated admissions preferences. LMHA now has two admissions preferences: A family that was in the Homeownership Program after leaving the Housing Choice Voucher program economically independent but who now, through extenuating circumstances, needs Housing Choice Voucher assistance again, and; Special Referral Program families. Four other preferences (Involuntary displacement; Substandard housing; Paying more than 50% of the applicant's gross income for rent and/or utilities, and; A homeless applicant) were removed from the Administrative Plan.

III. Proposed MTW Activities: HUD Approval Requested

All activities proposed in the FY 2014 Plan that were granted approval by HUD are reported on in Section IV as “Approved Activities.”

IV. Approved MTW Activities: HUD Approval Previously Granted

This section of the Annual Plan describes approved MTW activities. It includes a brief description, anticipated changes (if any) and new metrics and baselines for each activity. Activities are organized by status:

- A. Implemented;
- B. Not yet implemented;
- C. On hold; and
- D. Closed out.

A. Implemented MTW Activities

For each previously approved and implemented activity, LMHA has provided:

- 1) The Plan Year in which the activity was first approved and implemented;
- 2) A description of the activity and an update on its status;
- 3) An indication of whether or not the Housing Authority anticipates any non-significant changes or modifications to the activity during the Plan Year; and
- 4) An indication of whether or not the Housing Authority anticipates changes or modifications to the metrics, baselines or benchmarks during the Plan year.

Within this report, implemented MTW activities have been grouped by topic area as follows:

- A.1 Occupancy at Elderly/Disabled High Rise Developments
- A.2 MTW Rent Policies (Non Rent Reform Demonstration)
- A.3 Occupancy Criteria for New Scattered Sites
- A.4 Public Housing Development
- A.5 Expanded Homeownership Opportunities
- A.6 Local Leased Housing Program
- A.7 Local, Non-Traditional Housing Programs

A.1 Occupancy at Elderly/Disabled High Rise Developments

LMHA had experienced decreasing occupancy rates at several of its elderly/disabled sites for many years. Through a combination of MTW initiatives, LMHA is reaching its goal of 97% occupancy at these sites. Higher occupancy rates at these sites improve LMHA's operating revenues and achieve greater cost effectiveness, and increase housing choices for 0- and 1-bedroom qualified applicants age 55 to 61.

ACTIVITY #10-2008: Local Definition of Elderly

1. Plan Year Approved and Implemented

Activity #10-2008 was proposed and implemented in FY 2008.

2. Description and Impact

This activity allows LMHA to use the following local definition of elderly: any family whose Head of Household, Cohead, or Spouse is age 55 or above. LMHA had been experiencing decreased occupancy rates at its elderly/disabled-only high-rises prior to adopting a local definition of elderly for these communities. The MTW age criterion is used to determine eligibility for residency at Dosker Manor, Avenue Plaza, Lourdes Hall, Will E. Seay Plaza (formerly Bishop Lane Plaza), and Saint Catherine Court.

Opening up these sites to non-disabled families between ages 55 and 61 has raised occupancy rates and increased the pool of 1-bedroom and efficiency units available to these applicants. While these sites had an average occupancy rate of 90.8% when this activity was implemented in FY 2008, at the end of FY 2014, the average occupancy rate was 94.1%. Higher occupancy rates improve the agency's operating revenues and maximize the cost effectiveness of federal funding.

This activity was implemented in FY 2008; it is on schedule.

The LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

<i>Housing Choice #4: Displacement Prevention</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move (decrease). If units reach a specific type of household, give that type in this box: Families whose HoH, Cohead or Spouse is age 55+ that would like to live at the sites covered by the activity.	Households losing assistance/moving prior to implementation of the activity (number).	Expected households losing assistance/moving after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households losing assistance/moving after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2007: 0	0	0	Meets benchmark.
	Annual <i>number</i> of households at each site losing assistance/moving prior to implementation.	Expected <i>number</i> of households at each site losing assistance/moving 7/1/13 thru 6/30/14.	Actual <i>number</i> of households at each site losing assistance/moving 7/1/13 thru 6/30/14.	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys LIB				

Housing Choice #5: Increase in Resident Mobility

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households able to move to a *better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase). *Better unit is defined as a unit at one of the sites covered by the activity.	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual increase in households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2007: 0	N/A - Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	36	N/A – No benchmark was established for this metric.
	Prior to implementation, <i>number</i> of non-disabled families where HoH, cohead, or spouse is at least age 55, and neither the HoH, cohead, nor spouse is older than 61.	Expected <i>number</i> of non-disabled families where HoH, cohead, or spouse is at least age 55, and neither the HoH, cohead, nor spouse is older than 61 that move into a covered site between 7/1/13 & 6/30/14.	Actual <i>number</i> of non-disabled families where HoH, cohead, or spouse is at least age 55, and neither the HoH, cohead, nor spouse is older than 61 that move into a covered site between 7/1/13 & 6/30/14.	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys LIB				

2.i. Rent Reform Hardship Requests

N/A. This is not a rent reform activity.

3. Benchmarks Not Achieved

N/A. This activity has proven effective, and all benchmarks have been met.

4. Revised Metrics

LMHA has replaced all locally-defined metrics with new, HUD-required Standard Metrics.

5. Changes to Data Collection Methodology

LMHA has replaced all locally-defined metrics with HUD-required Standard Metrics. Standard Metrics data for this activity is collected from the agency's housing and tenant management software system, Emphasys.

ACTIVITY #23-2010: Lease-Up Incentives for New Residents at Dosker Manor

1. Plan Year Approved and Implemented

Activity #23-2010 was proposed and implemented in FY 2010.

2. Description

This activity provides lease-up incentives to new residents at Dosker Manor, an elderly/disabled high-rise located in downtown Louisville. New residents receive a waiver of the initial deposit and the first month's rent free.

Before the initiative's implementation in FY 2010, occupancy at Dosker Manor had consistently averaged below 90% for some time. In FY 2009, the year before implementation, occupancy was 87%. In the years since implementation (FY 2010 – FY 2014), occupancy has averaged 94%.

This activity was implemented in FY 2010; it is on schedule.

The LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

<i>Cost Effectiveness #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Rental revenue in dollars (increase).	Rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2013: ¹ \$1,212,767 (Total rental revenue)	N/A - Metric not included in FY 2014 Plan	\$63,337 (FY 2014 rental revenue (\$1,276,104) minus FY 2013 rental revenue (\$1,212,767))	N/A – No benchmark was established for this metric.
	Sum of gross (net) annual rental revenue from new households at Dosker Manor prior to implementation	Expected sum of gross annual rental revenue at Dosker Manor as of 6/30/14	Actual sum of gross rental revenue from new Dosker Manor households that received the lease-up incentive between 7/1/13 thru 6/30/14	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): PHA financial records				

¹ FY 2013 is the earliest year for which data is available.

2.i. Rent Reform Hardship Requests

N/A. This is not a rent reform activity.

3. Benchmarks Not Achieved

N/A. Since HUD Standard Metrics were not included in the FY 2014 Plan, no FY 2014 benchmarks were established. Since implementation of this activity in FY 2010, Dosker Manor occupancy has consistently been higher than pre-implementation. For this reason, LMHA considers this initiative to be effective.

4. Revised Metrics

LMHA has replaced all locally-defined metrics with new, HUD-required Standard Metrics.

5. Changes to Data Collection Methodology

LMHA has replaced all locally-defined metrics with HUD-required Standard Metrics. Standard Metrics data for this activity is collected from the agency's financial statements.

A.2 MTW Rent Policies (Non Rent Reform Demonstration)

The MTW Demonstration also allows LMHA to rethink other policies – like the rent policy for the Public Housing and HCV programs – to encourage families to work towards housing self-sufficiency. Alternate rent structures also ease the burden on residents and the agency. As part of LMHA’s rent reform goals, the Authority will continue to use HUD’s Enterprise Income Verification (EIV) System in its day-to-day operations.

ACTIVITY #32-2012: Elimination of the Mandatory Earned Income Disregard

1. Plan Year Approved and Implemented

Activity #32-2012 was proposed and approved in FY 2012. It was implemented in the HCV Program in FY 2012 and in the Public Housing Program in FY 2014.

2. Description and Impact

The Earned Income Disregard (EID) allows tenants who have been out of work to accept a job without having their rent increase right away. During the first year of employment, all earnings are excluded from the calculation of the tenant’s rent. During the second year of employment, only half of the tenant’s earnings are excluded from this calculation. A tenant may only benefit from the EID for a maximum of 48 months during their lifetime.

This activity was implemented on schedule in the HCV program in FY 2012.¹ The 15 families actively taking advantage of the EID benefit at that time were allowed to continue receiving the disregard under the rules applicable to traditional PHAs. During FY 2012, the Housing Authority saved \$391 in administrative costs by eliminating the calculation of EID, and annual rent revenue increased by approximately \$7,646. Full savings from the activity were not realized that year, as some families continued to receive the EID (Over the course of the year, the number of households receiving the EID decreased from 15 to 5).

By the end of FY 2014, no HCV program households were receiving the EID, saving the agency \$447 in administrative costs and increasing annual rent revenue by approximately \$23,246 when compared to the FY 2011 benchmark.

The LMHA stopped processing the EID for newly-eligible families in the Public Housing program as of April 1, 2014. As FY 2013 data was not tracked for the Public Housing portion of this activity, LMHA does not have baseline data for the year before implementation. Instead, FY 2014 data will be used as the baseline against which future outcomes will be measured.

The LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

Cost Effectiveness #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the

¹ Under MTW activity #6-2008, elderly families, whose only other source of income (in addition to earnings from employment) is their Social Security entitlement, are eligible for a \$7,500 annual EID. These families are excluded from activity #32-2012.

				benchmark.
HCV Program				
As of FY2011: \$447 (15 households * \$29.80)	\$0 (0 households * \$0)	\$0 (0 households * \$0)		Meets benchmark
Public Housing Program				
As of FY2014: ¹ \$2,154 (62 households * \$34.74)	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	\$2,154 (62 households * \$34.74)		N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan.
Number of households receiving EID <i>multiplied</i> by the average cost per household to track/calculate annually prior to implementation	Anticipated number of households that will receive EID <i>multiplied</i> by the average anticipated cost per household to track/calculate annually as of 6/30/14	Actual number of households receiving EID <i>multiplied</i> by the actual average cost per household to calculate/track annually as of 6/30/14		Explanation to be provided

Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs; PHA financial records

¹ Activity implemented in Public Housing program during FY 2014. No FY 2013 data is available. FY 2014 data will be used as the baseline against which future outcomes will be measured.

Cost Effectiveness #2: Staff Time Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	HCV Program			
	As of FY2011: 20.1 hours (15 households * 1.34 hours)	0 hours (0 households * 0 hours)	0 hours (0 households * 0 hours)	Meets benchmark
	Public Housing Program			
	As of FY2014: ¹ 65.1 hours (62 households * 1.05 hours)	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	65.1 hours (62 households * 1.05 hours)	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan.
	Number of households receiving EID <i>multiplied</i> by the average staff time required per household to track/calculate EID annually prior to implementation	Expected number of households receiving EID <i>multiplied</i> by the average staff time required per household to track/calculate EID annually as of 6/30/14	Actual households receiving EID <i>multiplied</i> by the average staff time required per household to track/calculate EID annually as of 6/30/14	Explanation to be provided

Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs; PHA financial records

¹ Activity implemented in Public Housing program during FY 2014. No FY 2013 data is available. FY 2014 data will be used as the baseline against which future outcomes will be measured.

Cost Effectiveness #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?

Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease). The task is tracking/calculating a household's TTP according to the Mandatory EID rules.	Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity (percentage).	Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	HCV Program			
	As of FY2011: Not tracked.	N/A (EID no longer calculated)	N/A (EID no longer calculated)	N/A (EID no longer calculated)
	Public Housing Program			
	As of FY2014: ¹ Not tracked.	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	Not tracked.	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
	Average error rate, as a <i>percentage</i> , of tracking/calculating household TTP according to EID rules prior to implementation	Expected error rate, as a <i>percentage</i> , of tracking/calculating household TTP according to EID rules as of 6/30/14	Actual error rate, as a <i>percentage</i> , of tracking/calculating household TTP as of 6/30/14	Explanation to be provided.
Data Source(s): Staff logs; Emphasys				

¹ Activity implemented in Public Housing program during FY 2014. No FY 2013 data is available. FY 2014 data will be used as the baseline against which future outcomes will be measured.

Cost Effectiveness #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Rental revenue in dollars (increase).	Rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	HCV Program			
	As of FY2011: Not tracked ¹	\$23,246	\$23,246	Meets benchmark.
	Public Housing Program			
	As of FY2014: ² \$93,300	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	\$93,300	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan.
	Sum of gross (net) annual rent revenue from households receiving EID prior to implementation	Expected <i>sum</i> of gross (net) annual rental revenue from households no longer receiving EID as of 6/30/14	Actual <i>sum</i> of gross (net) annual rental revenue from households no longer receiving EID as of 6/30/14	Explanation to be provided.
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records				

¹ Although the sum of annual rent revenue from families receiving the EID prior to implementation is not available, the Housing Authority did track the amount of annual income disregarded through the EID policy in FY 2011 (\$77,487). Assuming approximately 30% of this amount would have been contributed to the tenant's annual rent, the agency forewent approximately \$23,246 in rent revenue.

² Activity implemented in Public Housing program during FY 2014. No FY 2013 data is available. FY 2014 data will be used as the baseline against which future outcomes will be measured.

2.i. Rent Reform Hardship Requests

No hardship requests were received during FY 2014.

3. Benchmarks Not Achieved

N/A. All HCV program metrics were achieved. No FY 2014 benchmarks were established for the Public Housing program.

4. *Revised Metrics*

LMHA has replaced all locally-defined metrics with new, HUD-required Standard Metrics.

5. *Changes to Data Collection Methodology*

LMHA has replaced all locally-defined metrics with HUD-required Standard Metrics. Standard Metrics data for this activity is collected from the agency's housing and tenant management software system, Emphasys; staff logs; and agency financial records.

ACTIVITY #8-2008: Standard Medical Deduction

1. *Plan Year Approved and Implemented*

Activity #8-2008 was proposed and implemented in FY 2008.

2. *Description and Impact*

Under this activity, disabled and elderly families in both the Public Housing and HCV programs are eligible to receive a \$1,600 standard medical deduction. Families electing the deduction do not have to furnish documentation of medical expenses, such as bills, receipts, records of payment, dates of trips, mileage log, or receipts for fares and tolls. The standard medical deduction is not mandatory; if the families' health care costs exceed the \$1,600 exemption, the family can choose to have their expenses itemized.

While compiling data for this report, LMHA discovered that due to an automatic calculation occurring in the agency's tenant management system, this activity has not been functioning in the manner the agency intended.

Through this MTW activity, LMHA intended for families to receive a flat \$1,600 standard medical deduction regardless of the family's annual income as in the following example:

Family's Annual Income	\$12,000
<u>(Standard Medical Deduction)</u>	<u>- \$ 1,600</u>
Resulting Annual Income	\$10,400

However, under the rules applicable to a traditional PHA, medical expenses can only be deducted to the extent that they exceed 3% of annual income. So a sample family having an annual income of \$12,000 and \$1,600 in medical expenses would have their deduction calculated in the following manner:

Family's Annual Income	\$12,000
<u>(Medical Expenses Exceeding 3% of Income)</u>	<u>- \$ 1,240</u>
Resulting Annual Income	\$10,760

Although LMHA staff has consistently been entering \$1,600 in medical expenses for families eligible for this activity, the agency's computerized tenant management system (which was originally programmed to calculate income according to the rules applicable to a traditional PHA) has only been deducting the portion of the standard medical deduction that exceeds 3% of the family's annual income. The unintended consequence is that families have not been benefiting from this activity to the extent anticipated. The Housing Authority is now working with its software

vendor to correct the issue, and will provide a progress update in the agency's FY 2015 Annual Report.

Despite the systems issue, this activity continued to result in administrative cost savings during FY 2014. Foregoing the verification of medical expenses for the 5,020 households that took the standard medical deduction resulted in savings of \$45,343.

This activity was implemented on schedule in FY 2008.

The LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

CE #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline¹	Benchmark	Outcome²	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of verifying household medical expenses and calculating household medical deductions in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	HCV Program			
	As of FY 2009: \$29,714 (3,529 households * \$8.42)	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	As of 6/10/2015: \$27,982 (3,446 households * \$8.12)	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
	Public Housing Program			
	As of FY 2009: \$5,246 (623 * \$8.42)	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	As of 6/10/2015: \$17,361 (1,574 households * \$11.03)	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
	Agency-Wide			
	As of FY 2009: \$34,960 (\$29,714 in HCV+ \$5,246 in Public Housing)	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	As of 6/10/2015: \$45,343 (\$27,982 in HCV + \$17,361 in Public Housing)	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
	Number of households receiving the itemized medical deduction <i>multiplied by</i> the average cost per household to calculate/verify medical expenses annually prior to implementation	Anticipated number of households receiving the standard medical deduction <i>multiplied by</i> the average cost savings per household to use the standard deduction during FY 2014	Actual number of households receiving the standard medical deduction <i>multiplied by</i> the average cost savings per household to use the standard deduction during FY 2014	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs; PHA financial records				

¹ FY 2009 is earliest year for which data is available. Staff cost averages hourly rate with benefits for HCV Specialist and Public Housing Service Specialist (\$25.25 / hour).

² FY 2014 data is not available. Outcomes are reported as of 6/10/2015.

CE #2: Staff Time Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline¹	Benchmark	Outcome²	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete verifications of medical expenses and calculations of medical	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	HCV Program			
	As of FY 2009: 1,176 hours	N/A. Metric not	As of 6/10/2015: 1,149	N/A. Metric

deduction in staff hours (decrease).	(3,529 households * 0.33 hours)	included in FY2014 Plan	hours (3,446 households * 0.33 hours)	not included in FY2014 Plan
Public Housing Program				
	As of FY 2009: 208 hours (623 households * 0.33 hours)	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	As of 6/10/2015: 525 hours (1,574 households * 0.33 hours)	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
Agency-Wide				
	As of FY 2009: 1,384 hours (1,176 hours in HCV + 208 hours in Public Housing)	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	As of 6/10/2015: 1,674 hours (1,149 hours in HCV + 525 hours in Public Housing)	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
	Number of households receiving the itemized medical deduction <i>multiplied</i> by the average staff time required per household to calculate/verify medical expenses annually before implementation	Anticipated number of households receiving the standard medical deduction <i>multiplied</i> by the average staff time savings per use the standard medical deduction during FY 2014	Actual number of households receiving the standard medical deduction <i>multiplied</i> by the average staff time savings per use the standard medical deduction during FY 2014	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs; PHA financial records				

¹ FY 2009 is earliest year for which data is available.

² FY 2014 data is not available. Outcomes are reported as of 6/10/2015.

Cost Effectiveness #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average error rate in completing the calculation of a household's medical deduction, as a percentage (decrease).	Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity (percentage).	Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	HCV Program			
	As of FY2009: Not tracked	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	As of 6/10/2015: Not tracked	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
	Public Housing Program			
	As of FY2009: Not tracked	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	As of 6/10/2015: Not tracked	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
	Agency-Wide			
	As of FY2009: Not tracked	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	As of 6/10/2015: Not tracked	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
	Average error rate, as a <i>percentage</i> , of calculating a household's medical deduction prior to implementation	Expected error rate, as a <i>percentage</i> , of calculating a household's medical deduction as of 6/30/14	Actual error rate, as a <i>percentage</i> , of calculating a household's medical deduction as of 6/30/14	Explanation to be provided.
Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs				

Cost Effectiveness #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome ¹	Benchmark Achieved?

Rental revenue in dollars (increase).	Rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	HCV Program			
	As of FY2009: Not tracked	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	As of 6/10/2015: \$12,234,144	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
	Public Housing Program			
	As of FY2009: Not tracked	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	As of 6/10/2015: \$3,243,984	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
	Agency-Wide			
	As of FY2009: Not tracked	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	As of 6/10/2015: \$15,478,128 (\$12,234,144 in HCV + \$3,243,984 in Public Housing)	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
	Sum of gross (net) annual rent revenue from households receiving medical deductions prior to implementation	Expected sum of gross (net) annual rental revenue from households receiving standard medical deductions as of 6/30/14	Actual sum of gross (net) annual rental revenue from households receiving standard medical deductions as of 6/30/14	Explanation to be provided.
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records				

² FY 2014 data is not available. Outcomes are reported as of 6/10/2015.

2.i. Rent Reform Hardship Requests

No hardship requests were made during FY 2014. Thirty-two families in the HCV program and 13 families in the Public Housing program with medical expenses exceeding \$1,600 chose to have their medical expenses itemized.

3. Benchmarks Not Achieved

N/A. Because HUD Standard Metrics were not included in the FY 2014 Plan, no FY 2014 benchmarks were established.

4. Revised Metrics

LMHA has replaced all locally-defined metrics with new, HUD-required Standard Metrics.

5. Changes to Data Collection Methodology

LMHA has replaced all locally-defined metrics with HUD-required Standard Metrics. Standard Metrics data for this activity is collected from the agency's housing and tenant management software system, Emphasys; staff logs; and agency financial records.

ACTIVITY #4-2007: Alternate Year Reexaminations of Elderly and Disabled Families

1. Plan Year Approved and Implemented

Activity #4-2007 was proposed and implemented in FY 2008.

2. Description and Impact

This activity allows LMHA to conduct a re-certification of elderly and disabled families in the Public Housing and HCV programs once every two years instead of annually.

In the HCV program, eligible households receive a full reexamination every odd numbered fiscal year. In even numbered years, families are required to complete a mini-recertification packet, which they return to the agency by mail. In the Public Housing program, each year 50% of eligible families receive a full reexamination of eligibility on the anniversary of their lease-up date.

This activity was implemented on schedule in FY 2008. Originally, the only households eligible for biennial recertifications were elderly families and disabled families where the head of household and/or spouse was age 55+. The activity was significantly amended in FY 2012 to include all disabled families, and HCV staff began conducting biennial recertifications for all disabled families that year. The expanded activity has not yet been implemented in the Public Housing program. The required changes were made to the agency's ACOP during FY 2014, and the Public Housing program plans to expand the activity to all disabled families during calendar year 2015.

As FY 2014 was an even numbered fiscal year, LMHA conducted mini-recertifications instead of full reexaminations for all elderly and disabled families in the HCV Program. In total, the agency spent \$14,080 to conduct 2,312 mini-recertifications. Had the agency conducted a full reexamination for each of these families, the cost would have been \$56,297. Thus, this activity produced \$42,217 in administrative cost savings in the HCV program during FY 2014.

In the Public Housing program during FY 2014, the agency spent \$17,473 to conduct full reexaminations of 704 of the 1,248 households that were either elderly families or disabled families where the head, co-head, and/or spouse was age 55+. Had LMHA done a full reexamination of all 1,248 of these Public Housing families, the cost would have been \$30,975. Thus, this activity produced \$13,502 in administrative cost savings in the Public Housing program during the fiscal year.

The LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

CE #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	HCV Program			
	As of FY2008: ¹ \$65,801 (2,607 full recertifications * \$25.24)	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	\$14,080 (2,312 mini-recertifications * \$6.09)	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
	Public Housing Program			
	As of FY2008: ² \$33,847 (1,788 households * \$18.93)	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	\$17,473 (704 full recertifications * \$24.82)	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
	Agency-Wide			
	As of FY2008: \$99,648 (\$65,801 in HCV + \$33,847 in Public Housing)	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	\$31,553 (\$14,080 in HCV + \$17,473 in Public Housing)	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
	Number of recertifications of eligible families <i>multiplied by</i>	Expected number of recertifications of	Actual number of recertifications of	Explanation to be provided

	the average cost to conduct a recertification prior to implementation	eligible families during FY 2014 <i>multiplied by the average cost per recertification</i>	eligible families during FY 2014 <i>multiplied by the average cost per recertification</i>	
--	---	--	--	--

Data Source(s): Emphasys; PIC; Staff logs.

¹ FY 2008 is earliest year for which data is available. 919 mini-recertifications were conducted that year. However, in FY 2008, only elderly families and disabled families where the head of household and/or spouse was age 55+ were eligible for a biennial recertification. This activity was expanded in FY 2012 to include all disabled families. Baseline estimates cost of doing a full recertification for all FY 2008 families that would have been eligible for current, expanded activity as follows: 1 hour per household * \$25.24 per staff hour * 2,607 households (919 households eligible for activity in FY 2008 + 1,688 disabled households that would have been eligible under current expanded activity).

² FY 2008 is earliest year for which data is available. 894 full reexaminations were conducted that year. Assuming twice as many families would have been reexamined had the activity not been in place, the baseline has been estimated as follows: 1,788 households * 0.75 hours per household * \$24.90 per staff hour.

Cost Effectiveness #2: Staff Time Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	HCV Program			
	As of FY2008: ¹ 2,607 hours (2,607 recertifications * 1 hour)	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	578 hours (2,312 mini-recertifications * 0.25 hours)	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
	Public Housing Program			
	As of FY2008: ² 1,341 hours (1,788 full recertifications * 0.75 hours)	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	528 hours (704 full recertifications * 0.75 hours)	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
	Agency-Wide			
	As of FY2008: 3,948 hours (2,607 hours in HCV + 1,341 hours in Public Housing)	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	1,106 hours (578 hours in HCV + 528 hours in Public Housing)	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
	Number of recertifications of eligible families <i>multiplied by the average staff time required per recertification before activity implementation</i>	Expected number of recertifications of eligible families during FY 2014 <i>multiplied by the average staff time required per recertification</i>	Actual number of recertifications of eligible families during FY 2014 <i>multiplied by the average staff time required per recertification</i>	Explanation to be provided

Data Source(s): Emphasys; PIC; Staff logs; PHA financial records

¹ FY 2008 is earliest year for which data is available. 919 mini-recertifications were conducted that year. However, in FY 2008, only elderly families and families where head of household and/or spouse was age 55+ were eligible for a biennial recertification. This activity was expanded in FY 2012 to include all disabled families. Baseline estimates total hours of staff time required to conduct a full recertification for all FY 2008 families that would have been eligible for current, expanded activity as follows: 1 hour per household * 2,607 households (919 elderly households eligible for activity in FY 2008 + 1,688 disabled households that would have been eligible under current expanded activity).

² FY 2008 is earliest year for which data is available. 894 full reexaminations were conducted that year. Assuming twice as many families would have been reexamined had the activity not been in place, baseline estimates staff time as follows: 1,788 households * 0.75 hours per household.

Cost Effectiveness #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Rental revenue in dollars (increase).	Rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	HCV Program			
	As of FY 2008: Not tracked	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	\$8,610,180	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
	Public Housing Program			
	As of FY 2008: Not tracked	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	\$2,705,316	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
	Agency-Wide			
	As of FY 2008: Not tracked	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	\$11,315,496 (\$8,610,180 in HCV + \$2,705,316 in Public Housing)	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
	<i>Sum of gross (net) annual rent revenue from eligible households prior to implementation</i>	Expected <i>sum of gross (net) annual rent revenue from eligible households as of 6/30/14</i>	Actual <i>sum of gross (net) annual rent revenue from eligible households as of 6/30/14</i>	Explanation to be provided.
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records				

2.i. Rent Reform Hardship Requests

No hardship requests were made during FY 2014. Elderly (55+) and/or disabled families that experience a loss of income or an increase in expenses between biennial recertifications may request an interim reexamination.

3. Benchmarks Not Achieved

N/A. Since HUD Standard Metrics were not included in the FY 2014 Plan, no FY 2014 benchmarks were established.

4. Revised Metrics

LMHA has replaced all locally-defined metrics with new, HUD-required Standard Metrics.

5. Changes to Data Collection Methodology

LMHA has replaced all locally-defined metrics with HUD-required Standard Metrics. Standard Metrics data for this activity is collected from the agency's housing and tenant management software system, Emphasys; PIC; staff logs; and agency financial records.

ACTIVITY #6-2008: Earned Income Disregard for Elderly HCV Families

1. Plan Year Approved and Implemented

Activity #6-2008 was proposed and implemented in FY 2008.

2. Description and Impact

This activity provides a \$7,500 earned income disregard to elderly families in the HCV program who's only other sources of income (in addition to earnings from employment) are Social Security entitlements.

During FY 2014, four elderly HCV households took advantage of the EID, and a total of \$14,751 of earned income was disregarded. Assuming these families would have paid approximately 30% of these earnings in rent, these families retained a total of \$4,425 in additional income that otherwise would have gone to rent payments. In addition, LMHA did not have to verify earned income for these four families, producing \$24.35 in administrative cost savings.

This activity was implemented on schedule in FY 2008. Baseline data for the year prior to implementation (FY 2007) is not available. Baseline data is as of the earliest year for which data is available, FY 2009.

The LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

<i>Self-Sufficiency #1: Increase in Household Income</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline¹	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).	Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average earned income of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	FY 2009: \$5,651	\$5,000	\$3,688	Outcome does not meet benchmark. See section 3 below for explanation.
	Average gross annual income from the number of eligible HCV households before implementation	Expected average gross income from the number of eligible HCV households as of 6/30/14	Actual average gross income from the number of eligible HCV households as of 6/30/14	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PIC				

¹ FY 2009 is the earliest year for which data is available.

<i>Self-Sufficiency #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status</i>				
<i>Report the Baseline, Benchmark and Outcome data for each type of employment status for those head(s) of households affected by the self-sufficiency activity.</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline^{1&2}	Benchmark²	Outcome²	Benchmark Achieved?
Report the following information separately for each category:	Head(s) of households in <<category name>> prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected head(s) of households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual head(s) of households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
(1) Employed Full-Time	As of FY 2009: 0% (0 households / 0 households)	0% (0 households / 0 households)	0% (0 households / 0 households)	Meets benchmark.
(2) Employed Part-Time	As of FY 2009: 0% (0 households / 0 households)	0% (0 households / 0 households)	0% (0 households / 0 households)	Meets benchmark.

	households)			
(3) Enrolled in an Educational Program	As of FY 2009: 0% (0 households / 0 households)	0% (0 households / 0 households)	0% (0 households / 0 households)	Meets benchmark.
(4) Enrolled in Job Training Program	As of FY 2009: 0% (0 households / 0 households)	0% (0 households / 0 households)	0% (0 households / 0 households)	Meets benchmark.
(5) Unemployed	As of FY 2009: 0% (0 households / 0 households)	0% (0 households / 0 households)	0% (0 households / 0 households)	Meets benchmark.
(6) Other	As of FY 2009: 0% (0 households / 0 households)	0% (0 households / 0 households)	0% (0 households / 0 households)	Meets benchmark.
	Percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> prior to implementation of activity (percent). This number may be zero.	Expected percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> as of 6/30/2014 (percent).	Actual percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> as of 6/30/2014 (percent).	Explanation to be provided.

Data Source(s): Emphasys

¹ FY 2009 is the earliest year for which data is available.

² HUD's instructions indicate that baseline, benchmark, and outcome numbers should include the "percentage of total work-able households" in each category. LMHA does not consider elderly families to be "work-able" households.

<i>Self-Sufficiency #5: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self Sufficiency</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline^{1&2}	Benchmark²	Outcome²	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase self sufficiency (increase).	Households receiving self sufficiency services prior to implementation of the activity (number).	Expected number of households receiving self sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual number of households receiving self sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY2009: 0	0	0	Meets benchmark.
				Explanation to be provided

Data Source(s): Emphasys

¹ FY 2009 is the earliest year for which data is available.

² Elderly and disabled families are excluded from LMHA's definition of "households transitioned to self sufficiency" as these households are not considered "work-able." Since these households by definition cannot transition to self-sufficiency, they are not considered to receive services that promote self sufficiency.

<i>Self-Sufficiency #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline^{1&2}	Benchmark²	Outcome²	Benchmark Achieved?

Number of households transitioned to self sufficiency (increase). The PHA may create one or more definitions for "self sufficiency" to use for this metric. Each time the PHA uses this metric, the "Outcome" number should also be provided in Section (II) Operating Information in the space provided.	Households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	0	0	0	Meets benchmark.
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys				

¹ FY 2009 is the earliest year for which data is available.

² Elderly and disabled families are excluded from LMHA's definition of "households transitioned to self sufficiency" as these households are not considered "work-able."

<i>CE #1: Agency Cost Savings</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline ¹	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY2009: \$102.16 (16 households * \$6.39)	\$59.20 (10 households * \$5.92)	\$24.35 (4 households * \$6.09)	Outcome does not meet benchmark. See section 3 below for explanation.
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs; PHA financial records				

¹ FY 2009 is the earliest year for which data is available.

<i>CE #2: Staff Time Savings</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline ¹	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY2009: 4 hours (16 households * 0.25 hours)	2.5 hours (10 households * 0.25 hours)	1 hour (4 households * 0.25 hours)	Outcome does not meet benchmark. See section 3 below for explanation.
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs; PHA financial records				

¹ FY 2009 is the earliest year for which data is available.

<i>Cost Effectiveness #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline ¹	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?

Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease).	Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity (percentage).	Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	FY 2009: Not tracked	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	Not tracked	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
				Explanation to be provided.
Data Source(s): Staff logs				

¹ FY 2009 is the earliest year for which data is available.

<i>Cost Effectiveness #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline ¹	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Rental revenue in dollars (increase).	Rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2009: Not tracked	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	\$24,756	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
				Explanation to be provided.
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records				

¹ Although the sum of annual rent revenue from families eligible for the activity in FY 2009 is not available, the Housing Authority did track the amount of annual income disregarded through the EID policy that year (\$90,420). Assuming approximately 30% of this amount would have been contributed to the tenant's annual rent, the agency forewent approximately \$27,126 in rent revenue.

2.i. Rent Reform Hardship Requests

No hardship requests were made during FY 2014. Activity cannot adversely affect eligible households

3. Benchmarks Not Achieved

Self-Sufficiency #1: Increase in Household Income

LMHA anticipated that the average earned income of elderly HCV households taking advantage of the EID during FY 2014 would be \$5,000. In fact, earned income averaged \$3,688. However, of the 4 households benefiting from the EID, half earned less than \$5,000 and half earned more than this amount with earned income ranging from \$180 to \$6,379. Given the small sample size and the fact that half of affected households earned more than the benchmark, LMHA does not believe that this outcome indicates reduced effectiveness of the activity.

CE #1: Agency Cost Savings

LMHA anticipated that this activity would produce \$59.20 in administrative cost savings during FY 2014. In fact, these savings totaled \$24.35. This activity has traditionally affected a very small number of elderly HCV households with only three families taking advantage of the earned income disregard in FY 2013. Given the fact that the number of households benefiting from the activity increased year-over-year, LMHA does not believe that this outcome indicates reduced effectiveness of the activity.

CE #2: Staff Time Savings

LMHA anticipated that this activity would save 2.5 hours of staff time during FY 2014. In fact, staff time savings totaled 1.0 hours. This activity has traditionally saved a very small number of staff hours with only 0.75 hours saved in FY 2013. Given the fact that the number of staff hours saved increased year-over-year, LMHA does not believe that this outcome indicates reduced effectiveness of the activity.

4. *Revised Metrics*

LMHA has replaced all locally-defined metrics with new, HUD-required Standard Metrics.

5. *Changes to Data Collection Methodology*

LMHA has replaced all locally-defined metrics with HUD-required Standard Metrics. Standard Metrics data for this activity is collected from the agency's housing and tenant management software system, Emphasys; PIC; staff logs; and agency financial records.

A.3 Occupancy Criteria for New Scattered Sites

ACTIVITY #9-2007: Term Limits and Employment / Education Requirements in New Scattered Site Units

ACTIVITY #21-2010: Mandatory Case Management in New Scattered Site Units

Many of LMHA's Scattered Sites are highly desirable properties, especially the newly acquired or constructed off-site HOPE VI Clarksdale Replacement Scattered Site units. The amenities and existing low rent structure may in some instances discourage residents from moving out of the unit towards self-sufficiency. LMHA is piloting term limits (Activity #9-2007), work requirements (Activity #9-2007) and mandatory case management (Activity #21-2010) for residents at these sites and evaluating the potential of the initiatives to incite residents to move up and out of the Public Housing program. Because these two activities affect the same population, including standard metrics tables for each activity would simply repeat the same metrics twice. The two activities function together, and the agency is unable to say how much each activity separately influenced the outcomes. For this reason, the LMHA has combined the reporting for these activities. All required reporting elements are provided for each activity.

1. Plan Year Approved and Implemented

Activity #9-2007 (Term Limits and Work Requirements) was proposed and implemented in FY 2007. Activity #21-2010 (Mandatory Case Management) was proposed and implemented in FY 2010.

2. Description and Impact

Activities #9-2007 (Term Limits and Employment / Education Requirements) and #21-2010 (Mandatory Case Management) apply to public housing families residing at detached single-family, scattered site houses created off-site under the Clarksdale HOPE VI Revitalization program and to those acquired or developed since LMHA fulfilled its Clarksdale one-for-one replacement commitment.

Jointly, the activities impose a five-year occupancy term limit; require that heads of household who are neither elderly nor disabled be employed and working at least 20 hours per week; and provide that all families (including elderly and disabled) must participate in a case management program. The work requirement may be temporarily waived for full-time students enrolled at an accredited post-secondary educational institution.

Residents moving from another public housing unit to one of these houses may choose between general case management requiring quarterly contact or the Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS) program requiring monthly contact. Both case management options assist residents with movement toward self-sufficiency and include working to identify and eliminate barriers to sustained employment along with referrals to services related to education, employment, health, financial skills and home ownership. Residents opting for FSS commit to a more structured program with required financial skills classes as well as the potential to benefit from the FSS escrow account or an Individual Development Account (IDA). Residents agreeing to move directly from the external LMHA wait list to a term-limited unit are required to enroll in FSS.

Residents in the FSS program can benefit from two asset building options. Rent increases from earned income will be placed in an escrow account, which the resident will receive when completing FSS. Escrow accumulation will be limited for residents with significant earned income at the time of

FSS enrollment. For these residents LMHA may offer an IDA (matched savings) account to supplement the escrow account.

Residents who at the end of the five-year period are not ready to move to either market-rate rental housing or home ownership may request an extension to the occupancy term limit. Extensions may be considered based on accident or illness, completion of post-secondary education, or documented evidence of efforts to obtain market-rate rental or purchase a home. Under no circumstance will participation be extended more than two additional years. Residents who fail to participate in mandatory case management activities will be submitted to property management staff; the next step is returning to a public housing development that does not have work / education / case management requirements.

By all measures this activity has been highly successful at moving families towards self sufficiency. In FY 2014, a full 44% of the 109 non-elderly / non-disabled families living in the units covered by these activities met LMHA's definition of **self sufficiency** (see next paragraph). The employment rate for these households is more than 3 times the rate across all of the agency's public housing (63% versus 21%), and average earned income is almost 6 times as high (\$20,766 for affected households versus \$3,636 across all public housing). Average monthly rent payments are also higher (\$200 versus \$158), reducing the agency's per unit subsidy costs for participating households.

One of the HUD Standard Metrics for this activity requires LMHA to report the "number of households transitioned to self sufficiency," and asks the Housing Authority to define **self sufficiency** for itself. LMHA has chosen to define **self sufficiency** as "the ability of a non-elderly / non-disabled family to obtain and maintain suitable employment." For the purposes of this definition, **employment** means the household must be receiving earned income, and **suitable** is defined as annual earned income equal to or exceeding the minimum wage multiplied by 2,000 hours, which is equal to \$14,500 as of the writing of this Report. This is the minimum income required for a family to participate in the HCV Homeownership program. **Maintaining** employment is defined as being continuously employed for at least 1 year. If the head of household has completed educational milestones within the last 3 months, he/she can meet **maintaining** employment as follows: certification program – 9 months employment in the certified field; associate's degree – 6 months employment in a related field, and; bachelor's degree – 3 months employment in a related field.

The LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

<i>Self-Sufficiency #1: Increase in Household Income</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline¹	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).	Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average earned income of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2010: Not tracked.	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	\$20,766	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PIC				

¹ FY 2010 is the earliest year for which data for this activity is available.

<i>Self-Sufficiency #2: Increase in Household Savings</i>
--

Unit of Measurement	Baseline ¹	Benchmark	Outcome ²	Benchmark Achieved?
Average amount of savings/escrow of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).	Average savings/escrow amount of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). This number may be zero.	Expected average savings/escrow amount of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average savings/escrow amount of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2010: Not tracked.	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	\$3,310	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Tracking-at-a-Glance				

¹ FY 2010 is the earliest year for which data for this activity is available.

² FY 2014 outcome data is not available. Data is as of 6/11/2015.

Self-Sufficiency #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
<i>Report the Baseline, Benchmark and Outcome data for each type of employment status for those head(s) of households affected by the self-sufficiency activity.</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline ¹	Benchmark	Outcome ²	Benchmark Achieved?
Report the following information separately for each category:	Head(s) of households in <<category name>> prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected head(s) of households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual head(s) of households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
(1) Employed Full-Time	As of FY 2010: Not tracked ²	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	45% (49 of 109 households)	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
(2) Employed Part-Time	As of FY 2010: Not tracked ²	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	18% (20 of 109 households)	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
(3) Enrolled in an Educational Program	As of FY 2010: Not tracked	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	8% (9 of 109 households)	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
(4) Enrolled in Job Training Program	As of FY 2010: Not tracked	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	2% (2 of 109 households)	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
(5) Unemployed	As of FY 2010: 22% (17 of approximately 78 households) ⁴	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	37% (40 of 109 households)	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
(6) Other	As of FY 2010: Not tracked	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	Not tracked	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
	Percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> prior to implementation of activity (percent). This number may be zero.	Expected percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> as of 6/30/2014 (percent).	Actual percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> as of 6/30/2014 (percent).	Explanation to be provided.
Data Source(s): Emphasys				

¹ FY 2010 is the earliest year for which data for this activity is available.

² Although LMHA did not track part-time vs. full-time employment in FY 2010, the agency did track employment status more generally. That year 61 (78%) of approximately 78 non-elderly / non-disabled heads of household were employed.

³ Outcome data is as of 6/11/2015. Although 112 households lived in term-limited scattered site units as of this date, outcomes for this metric only include 109 non-elderly / non-disabled families. Three elderly / disabled families are excluded as these households are not subject to the employment / education requirement.

⁴ Although 100 households lived in term-limited scattered site units in FY 2010, this baseline only includes 78 non-elderly / non-disabled families. Twenty-two elderly / disabled families are excluded as these households were not subject to the employment / education requirement.

<i>Self-Sufficiency #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline¹	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease).	Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity (number).	Expected number of households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2010: Not tracked	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	16% (18 of 112 households)	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys				

¹ FY 2010 is the earliest year for which data for this activity is available.

<i>Self-Sufficiency #5: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self Sufficiency</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline¹	Benchmark	Outcome²	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase self sufficiency (increase).	Households receiving self sufficiency services prior to implementation of the activity (number).	Expected number of households receiving self sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual number of households receiving self sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2010: 36% (36 of 100 households)	85%	88% (98 of 112 households)	Outcome meets benchmark
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Tracking-at-a-Glance; Emphasys				

¹ FY 2010 is the earliest year for which data for this activity is available.

² FY 2014 outcome data is not available. Data is as of 6/11/2015.

<i>Self-Sufficiency #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline¹	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidies per household affected by this policy in dollars (decrease).	Average subsidy per household affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2010: Not tracked	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	\$6,108	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PIC; PHA financial records				

¹ FY 2010 is the earliest year for which data for this activity is available.

<i>Self-Sufficiency #7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline ¹	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
PHA rental revenue in dollars (increase).	PHA rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected PHA rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual PHA rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2010: Not tracked	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	\$247,188	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records				

¹ FY 2010 is the earliest year for which data for this activity is available.

<i>Self-Sufficiency #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline ¹	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households transitioned to self sufficiency (increase). The PHA may create one or more definitions for "self sufficiency" to use for this metric. Each time the PHA uses this metric, the "Outcome" number should also be provided in Section (II) Operating Information in the space provided.	Households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2010: Not tracked	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	44% (48 of 109 households) ²	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys				

¹ FY 2010 is the earliest year for which data for this activity is available.

² As a baseline was not established for this metric, LMHA is not able to say how many families were "transitioned" to self sufficiency during the year. Instead, the outcome represents the number of households that met the agency's definition of "self sufficiency" as of 6/11/2015. Furthermore, although 112 households lived in term-limited scattered site units as of this date, the outcome only includes 109 non-elderly / non-disabled families. Three elderly / disabled families are not included as these households are excluded from the LMHA's definition of "self sufficiency" (See Section 1 above.).

<i>Housing Choice #3: Decrease in Wait List Time</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline ¹	Benchmark	Outcome ²	Benchmark Achieved?
Average applicant time on wait list in months (decrease).	Average applicant time on wait list prior to implementation of the activity (in months).	Expected average applicant time on wait list after implementation of the activity (in months).	Actual average applicant time on wait list after implementation of the activity (in months).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2010: Not tracked	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	28 months	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys				

¹ FY 2010 is the earliest year for which data for this activity is available.

² FY 2014 outcome data is not available. Data is as of 6/11/2015.

2.i. Rent Reform Hardship Requests

N/A. This activity does not include rent reform.

3. Benchmarks Not Achieved

N/A. All benchmarks were met.

4. Revised Metrics

LMHA has replaced all locally-defined metrics with new, HUD-required Standard Metrics.

5. Changes to Data Collection Methodology

LMHA has replaced all locally-defined metrics with HUD-required Standard Metrics. Standard Metrics data for this activity is collected from the agency's housing and tenant management software system, Emphasys; PIC; Tracking-at-a-Glance; and agency financial records.

A.4 Public Housing Development

LMHA's goal is to transform the physical stock of the original family developments owned and managed by the agency in the coming years, replacing the current public housing developments with mixed income communities, while at the same time providing replacement units so that the overall number of families served will not decrease. LMHA has implemented the following MTW initiative designed to expedite the redevelopment process and ensure that all new and newly acquired properties are energy-efficient and cost effective.

ACTIVITY #18-2009: Simplification of the Public Housing Development Submittal

1. *Plan Year Approved and Implemented*

Activity #18-2009 was proposed and implemented in FY 2009.

2. *Description and Impact*

This activity simplifies the public housing development submittal process for each acquired or developed public housing property. Twice yearly, LMHA also submits a six month report summarizing the Agency's acquisition and development activities to the HUD Louisville Field Office. The activity has reduced the amount of time staff spends preparing development submittals and reduced the average length of time to close on a property.

Although LMHA did not use the regulatory flexibility provided through this MTW activity during FY 2014 as the agency did not acquire any public housing units, between FY 2009 and FY 2013 the initiative reduced the amount of staff time required to prepare a proposal significantly from 25 hours to 7.5 hours. The length of time required to close on a property was also reduced from an average of 8-10 weeks to approximately 6 weeks.

The LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

Cost Effectiveness #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline¹	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2008: \$12,249 (9 submittals * 25 hours * \$54.44 per hour)	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	\$0 (0 submittals * 0 hours)	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Staff logs; PHA financial records				

¹ FY 2008 is the earliest year for which data for this activity is available. Staff hourly rate for FY 2008 is not available. FY 2009 hourly rate of \$54.44 (including benefits) was used instead.

Cost Effectiveness #2: Staff Time Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline¹	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?

Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2008: 225 hours (9 submittals *25 hours)	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	0 hours (0 submittals * 0 hours)	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Staff logs; PHA financial records				

¹ FY 2008 is the earliest year for which data for this activity is available.

<i>Housing Choice #1: Additional Units of Housing Made Available</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline ¹	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of new housing units made available for households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity (increase). If units reach a specific type of household, give that type in this box.	Housing units of this type prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected housing units of this type after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual housing units of this type after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of 2008: Not tracked	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	0	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): PIC; Staff logs				

¹ FY 2008 is the earliest year for which data for this activity is available.

2.i. Rent Reform Hardship Requests

N/A. This activity does not include rent reform.

3. Benchmarks Not Achieved

N/A. Since HUD Standard Metrics were not included in the FY 2014 Plan, no FY 2014 benchmarks were established.

4. Revised Metrics

LMHA has replaced all locally-defined metrics with new, HUD-required Standard Metrics.

5. Changes to Data Collection Methodology

LMHA has replaced all locally-defined metrics with HUD-required Standard Metrics. Standard Metrics data for this activity is collected from PIC; staff logs; and agency financial records.

A.5 Expanded Homeownership Opportunities

ACTIVITY #3-2006: Amount and Distribution of HCV Homeownership Assistance

1. *Plan Year Approved and Implemented*

Activity #3-2006 was proposed and implemented in FY 2006.

2. *Description and Impact*

This activity allows LMHA to offer a two-bedroom payment standard for all one-bedroom-eligible HCV Homeownership households and maintains the 110% of FMR local payment standard and the 120% of FMR payment standard in exception rent areas for the Homeownership program.

During FY 2014, eight HCV Homeownership Program participants purchased a home. This activity permitted 3 one-bedroom-eligible families to purchase a unit using the two-bedroom payment standard. None of these families bought homes in exception payment areas.

The LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

<i>Cost Effectiveness #1: Agency Cost Savings¹</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2005: N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): N/A				

¹ This activity does not modify the cost of any task performed by LMHA staff. Staff simply substitute one payment standard value for another when carrying out the same tasks they performed prior to implementation.

<i>Cost Effectiveness #2: Staff Time Savings¹</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2005: N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): N/A				

¹ This activity does not modify the amount of time spent on any task performed by LMHA staff. Staff simply substitute one payment standard value for another when carrying out the same tasks they performed prior to implementation.

<i>Housing Choice #5: Increase in Resident Mobility</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?

Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase).	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual increase in households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2005: 0	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	3	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs				

Housing Choice #6: Increase in Homeownership Opportunities				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households that purchased a home as a result of the activity (increase).	Number of households that purchased a home prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected number of households that purchased a home after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual number of households that purchased a home after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2005: 0	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	3	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs				

2.i. Rent Reform Hardship Requests

N/A. This activity does not include rent reform.

3. Benchmarks Not Achieved

N/A. Since HUD Standard Metrics were not included in the FY 2014 Plan, no FY 2014 benchmarks were established.

4. Revised Metrics

LMHA has replaced all locally-defined metrics with new, HUD-required Standard Metrics.

5. Changes to Data Collection Methodology

LMHA has replaced all locally-defined metrics with HUD-required Standard Metrics. Standard Metrics data for this activity is collected from Emphasys and staff logs.

ACTIVITY #13-2009: Exception Payment Standards for HCV Homeownership

1. Plan Year Approved and Implemented

Activity #13-2009 was proposed and implemented in FY 2009.

2. Description and Impact

This activity adjusts payment standards for HCV Homeownership to 120% of FMR in homeownership-specific Exception Payment areas, which are identified using Census 2000 Owner Occupied Median Value instead of Renter Occupied Median gross rent.

Although no HCV Homeownership Program participants purchased a home in an exception rent area during FY 2014, since FY 2009 this activity has allowed a total of 10 families (an average of nearly 2 per year) to buy homes in areas of opportunity. Part of the explanation may simply be that there were fewer home closings during FY 2014 than there have been on average in prior years. In FY 2013, for example, 18 program participants purchased homes with one family buying in an exception rent area. Regardless, the agency is currently exploring mechanisms to expand exception rent areas through better census data mapping.

The LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

<i>Cost Effectiveness #1: Agency Cost Savings¹</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2008: N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): N/A				

¹ This activity does not modify the cost of any task performed by LMHA staff. Staff simply substitutes one payment standard value for another when carrying out the same tasks they performed prior to implementation.

<i>Cost Effectiveness #2: Staff Time Savings¹</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2008: N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): N/A				

¹ This activity does not modify the amount of time spent on any task performed by LMHA staff. Staff simply substitutes one payment standard value for another when carrying out the same tasks they performed prior to implementation.

<i>Housing Choice #5: Increase in Resident Mobility</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase).	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual increase in households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2008: 0	2	0	Does not meet benchmark
Data Source(s): Emphasys				

<i>Housing Choice #6: Increase in Homeownership Opportunities</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households that purchased a home as a result of the activity (increase).	Number of households that purchased a home prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected number of households that purchased a home after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual number of households that purchased a home after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2008: 0	2	0	Does not meet benchmark
Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs				

2.i. Rent Reform Hardship Requests

N/A. This activity does not include rent reform.

3. Benchmarks Not Achieved

HC #5: Increase in Resident Mobility and HC #6: Increase in Homeownership Opportunities

LMHA anticipated that 2 HCV Homeownership Program participant families would purchase homes in exception rent areas during FY 2014. Although no HCV Homeownership Program participants purchased a home in an exception rent area during FY 2014, since FY 2009 this activity has allowed a total of 10 families (an average of nearly 2 per year) to buy homes in areas of opportunity. Part of the explanation may simply be that there were fewer home closings during FY 2014 than there have been on average in prior years. In FY 2013, for example, 18 program participants purchased homes with one family buying in an exception rent area. Regardless, the agency is currently exploring mechanisms to expand exception rent areas through better census data mapping.

4. Revised Metrics

LMHA has replaced all locally-defined metrics with new, HUD-required Standard Metrics.

5. Changes to Data Collection Methodology

LMHA has replaced all locally-defined metrics with HUD-required Standard Metrics. Standard Metrics data for this activity is collected from Emphasys; staff logs; and agency financial records.

ACTIVITY #11-2009: Flexibility in Third-Party Verifications for HCV Homeownership

1. Plan Year Approved and Implemented

Activity #11-2009 was proposed and implemented in FY 2009.

2. Description and Impact

Under this activity, income verification for HCV Homeownership program applicants remains valid for 8 months.

Once approved for the HCV Homeownership program, families have 8 months to execute and close on a proposed sales agreement. Since the income verification completed during the program application process is now valid for 8 months, staff no longer has to re-verify income for families

who take more than 60 days to close on a sale. Thus, the cost of this task (re-verifying income after 60 days) has dropped from \$179 pre-implementation (FY 2008) to \$0.

The LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

<i>Cost Effectiveness #1: Agency Cost Savings</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2008: \$179 (12 verifications * 0.5 hours * \$29.78 per hour)	\$0	\$0	Meets benchmark
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; staff logs; PHA financial records				

<i>Cost Effectiveness #2: Staff Time Savings</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2008: 6 hours (12 verifications * 0.5 hours)	0 hours	0 hours	Meets benchmark.
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; staff logs				

<i>Cost Effectiveness #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease).	Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity (percentage).	Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2008: Not tracked	N/A (Task no longer conducted)	N/A (Task no longer conducted)	N/A (Task no longer conducted)
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Staff logs.				

2.i. Rent Reform Hardship Requests

N/A. This activity does not include rent reform.

3. Benchmarks Not Achieved

N/A. All outcomes meet benchmark.

4. *Revised Metrics*

LMHA has replaced all locally-defined metrics with new, HUD-required Standard Metrics.

5. *Changes to Data Collection Methodology*

LMHA has replaced all locally-defined metrics with HUD-required Standard Metrics. Standard Metrics data for this activity is collected from Emphasys; staff logs; and agency financial records.

A.6 Local Leased Housing Program

Special Referral MTW HCV Programs

MTW allows LMHA to maximize the potential of locally available resources to develop programs for people with specific needs. The goal is to meet needs not met by other agencies and to partner with local organizations that have social services programs that need a housing support element. Some of these needs will be transitional; others are for programs that provide more long-term support, particularly for solo parents with children where the parent is working or preparing for work by participating in educational programs.

Special referral programs are intended to address the needs of traditionally underserved populations in the community, and provide the voucher as incentive for families to move toward economic self-sufficiency. The programs provide housing subsidy to 339 families through partnerships with a number of supportive services agencies. Families with specific needs often face multiple barriers to achieving their self-sufficiency goals. LMHA's special referral MTW HCV programs provide a strong incentive for participation as eligible applicants receive an admissions preference for the agency's HCV program, which has a current waitlist of more than 17,500 applicants. These programs also increase housing choice for low-income families.

Per HUD's request, LMHA has combined the reporting for these activities. All required elements are reported for each special referral program activity.

1. Plan Year Approved and Implemented

- 1) Activity #1-2005 (The Villager / Center for Women and Families) was proposed and implemented in FY 2005.
- 2) Activity #7-2008 (Day Spring) was proposed in FY 2008 and implemented in FY 2012.
- 3) Activity #15-2009 (Louisville / Family Scholar House) was proposed and implemented in FY 2008.
- 4) Activity #20-2010 (Downtown / Family Scholar House with Spalding University) was proposed in FY 2010 and implemented in FY 2011.
- 5) Activity #30-2012 (100,000 Homes Initiative) was proposed and implemented in FY 2012.
- 6) Activity #31-2012 (Stoddard Johnston / Family Scholar House) was proposed and implemented in FY 2012.
- 7) Activity #34-2012 (Wellspring - Youngland Avenue Facility) was proposed and implemented in FY 2012.
- 8) Activity #35-2012 (Allocate MTW Housing Choice Vouchers to Special Referral Programs) was proposed and implemented in FY 2012.
- 9) Activity #36-2013 (Wellspring – Bashford Manor Facility) was proposed and implemented in FY 2012.
- 10) Activity #38-2013 (Parkland / Family Scholar House) was proposed and implemented in FY 2013.

2. Description and Impact

Activity #1-2005: The Villager - Center for Women and Families

LMHA allocates up to 22 vouchers to a special referral program with the Center for Women and Families for their long-term transitional housing on their downtown campus. Programs at the Center focus on the elimination of domestic violence, sexual violence and economic hardship. This activity has increased housing choice and cost effectiveness.

Activity #7-2008: Day Spring

LMHA provides housing assistance to 4 households with members who have a severe mental illness and who live in a Day Spring constructed unit while they participate in the program. Day Spring, a faith-based charitable organization, provides residential and supportive services to adults with developmental disabilities who want the opportunity to live independently in a supportive community setting. Residents who receive voucher assistance must meet the HCV program income requirements; however, under the initiative, not all of the residential units will be subject to typical HUD Housing Quality Standards and rent reasonableness requirements.

Activity #15-2009: Louisville Scholar House / Family Scholar House (formerly Project Women)

LMHA allocates up to 56 vouchers to a special referral program with Family Scholar House for their Louisville Scholar House facility. Participants are solo heads of households, who often face multiple barriers to furthering their education and obtaining employment that will provide their families with adequate income to become self-sufficient.

Activity #20-2010: Downtown Scholar House - Family Scholar House with Spalding University

LMHA allocates 43 Housing Choice Vouchers annually to a special referral program with Family Scholar House and Spalding University at the Downtown Scholar House.

Activity #30-2012: 100,000 Homes Initiative

LMHA set aside 50 vouchers to a Special Referral HCV program with the 100,000 Homes initiative of the Louisville Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) Community Consortium. Participants in this Housing First model program, who are identified and referred by the Louisville SAMHSA, must be chronically homeless.

Activity #31-2012: Stoddard Johnston Scholar House - Family Scholar House

LMHA has set-aside 57 vouchers to a special referral program with Family Scholar House for their Stoddard Johnston Scholar House location.

Activity #34-2012: Wellspring - Youngland Avenue Facility

LMHA provides housing assistance to 5 households with members with severe mental illness who reside at Wellspring's Youngland Avenue facility while they are participating in the program. Wellspring is a charitable organization that addresses Louisville's need for supportive housing for adults with severe and persistent psychiatric illnesses. Referrals accepted for this initiative are considered to be Mainstream Program participants.

Activity #35-2012: Allocate MTW Housing Choice Vouchers to Special Referral Programs

LMHA may, without prior HUD approval, allocate up to 10 MTW Housing Choice Vouchers to a Special Referral HCV program for service-enriched affordable housing programs within the agency's jurisdiction. To be eligible, programs must offer housing and supportive services targeted to families whose needs are not adequately served elsewhere in the community. Some allocations are incremental additions to existing special referral programs while others are allocations to newly established programs. In 2012, LMHA allocated 10 vouchers to Coalition for the Homeless for homeless families with children. In 2013, the Agency allocated an additional 10 vouchers to the same referral program, as well as 10 vouchers to Family Scholar House participants who may choose to live at York Towers. In FY 2014, 10 vouchers were allocated to a program operated by Choices, Inc., which serves solo parent families that are both homeless and disabled.

Activity #36-2013: Wellspring – Bashford Manor Facility

This activity established a special referral program and local preference to provide housing assistance to 5 households with members with severe mental illness who reside at Wellspring's Youngland Avenue facility while they are participating in the program. Wellspring is a charitable organization that addresses Louisville's need for supportive housing for adults with severe and persistent psychiatric illnesses. Referrals accepted for this initiative are considered to be Mainstream Program participants.

Activity #38-2013: Parkland Scholar House - Family Scholar House

Under this activity, LMHA sets aside up to 53 vouchers, including 5 vouchers for participants who reside off-campus, for a special referral program with Family Scholar House for their Parkland Scholar House Facility. Vouchers become portable upon graduation and expire 5 years from participant's graduation date.

The LMHA tracks the following, combined HUD Standard Metrics for these activities:

<i>Cost Effectiveness #1: Agency Cost Savings</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline¹	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	N/A	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	Tracking mechanism to be determined	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Staff logs; PHA financial records				

¹ No baselines have been set as the implementation dates of LMHA special referral programs range from FY 2005 – FY 2013.

<i>Cost Effectiveness #2: Staff Time Savings</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline¹	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	N/A	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	Tracking mechanism to be determined	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Staff logs; PHA financial records				

¹ No baselines have been set as the implementation dates of LMHA special referral programs range from FY 2005 – FY 2013.

<i>Cost Effectiveness #4: Increase in Resources Leveraged</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline¹	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Amount of funds leveraged in dollars	Amount leveraged prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). This number may be zero.	Expected amount leveraged after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual amount leveraged after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

(increase).	N/A	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	Tracking mechanism to be determined	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
				Explanation to be provided

Data Source(s): Special referral program partner records

¹ No baselines have been set as the implementation dates of LMHA special referral programs range from FY 2005 – FY 2013.

<i>Self-Sufficiency #1: Increase in Household Income</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline¹	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).	Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	N/A	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	Tracking mechanism to be determined	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
				Explanation to be provided

Data Source(s): Emphasys

¹ No baselines have been set as the implementation dates of LMHA special referral programs range from FY 2005 – FY 2013.

<i>Self-Sufficiency #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status</i>				
<i>Report the Baseline, Benchmark and Outcome data for each type of employment status for those head(s) of households affected by the self-sufficiency activity.</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline¹	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Report the following information separately for each category:	Head(s) of households in <<category name>> prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected head(s) of households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual head(s) of households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
(1) Employed Full-Time	N/A	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	Tracking mechanism to be determined	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
(2) Employed Part-Time	N/A	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	Tracking mechanism to be determined	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
(3) Enrolled in an Educational Program	N/A	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	Tracking mechanism to be determined	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
(4) Enrolled in Job Training Program	N/A	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	Tracking mechanism to be determined	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
(5) Unemployed	N/A	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	Tracking mechanism to be determined	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
(6) Other	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

	Percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> prior to implementation of activity (percent). This number may be zero.	Expected percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> as of 6/30/2014 (percent).	Actual percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> as of 6/30/2014 (percent).	Explanation to be provided.
Data Source(s): Emphasys				

¹ No baselines have been set as the implementation dates of LMHA special referral programs range from FY 2005 – FY 2013.

<i>Self-Sufficiency #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline¹	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease).	Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity (number).	Expected number of households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	N/A	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	Tracking mechanism to be determined	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys				

¹ No baselines have been set as the implementation dates of LMHA special referral programs range from FY 2005 – FY 2013.

<i>Self-Sufficiency #5: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self Sufficiency</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline¹	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase self sufficiency (increase).	Households receiving self sufficiency services prior to implementation of the activity (number).	Expected number of households receiving self sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual number of households receiving self sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	N/A	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	Tracking mechanism to be determined	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Special referral program partners				

¹ No baselines have been set as the implementation dates of LMHA special referral programs range from FY 2005 – FY 2013.

<i>Self-Sufficiency #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline¹	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidies per household affected by this policy in dollars	Average subsidy per household affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	N/A	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	Tracking mechanism to be determined	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
				Explanation to

(decrease).				be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records.				

¹ No baselines have been set as the implementation dates of LMHA special referral programs range from FY 2005 – FY 2013.

<i>Self-Sufficiency #7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline ¹	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
PHA rental revenue in dollars (increase).	PHA rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected PHA rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual PHA rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	N/A	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	Tracking mechanism to be determined	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records.				

¹ No baselines have been set as the implementation dates of LMHA special referral programs range from FY 2005 – FY 2013.

<i>Self-Sufficiency #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households transitioned to self sufficiency (increase). The PHA may create one or more definitions for "self sufficiency" to use for this metric. ¹ Each time the PHA uses this metric, the "Outcome" number should also be provided in Section (II) Operating Information in the space provided.	Households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	N/A	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	Tracking mechanism to be determined	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Various				

¹ No baselines have been set as the implementation dates of LMHA special referral programs range from FY 2005 – FY 2013.

² LMHA defines **self sufficiency** as follows: "the ability of a non-elderly / non-disabled family to obtain and maintain suitable employment."

<i>Housing Choice #3: Decrease in Wait List Time</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline ¹	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average applicant time on wait list in months (decrease).	Average applicant time on wait list prior to implementation of the activity (in months).	Expected average applicant time on wait list after implementation of the activity (in months).	Actual average applicant time on wait list after implementation of the activity (in months).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	N/A	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	Tracking mechanism to be determined	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys				

¹ No baselines have been set as the implementation dates of LMHA special referral programs range from FY 2005 – FY 2013.

A table summarizing LMHA's Special Referral Programs follows:

**LMHA Special Referral MTW Voucher Programs
FY 2014**

Organization	Site	Voucher Allocation	FY Activity Proposed (FY Approved, if different)	FY First Voucher Issued	Portable? <i>Term Limited?</i>	Streamlined Admission?	MTW Inspections?
Center for Women and Families	Villager	22	2005	2005	Full portability upon program completion.	Yes	Yes: For initial lease-up, C.O. was used. After initial move-in, with new occupant and once per year concurrently.
Family Scholar House	Louisville Scholar House	56	2008	2008	Full portability upon program completion.	No	Yes: For initial lease-up, C.O. was used. After initial move-in, with new occupant and at recert.
Family Scholar House	Downtown Scholar House	54	2010	2011	Full portability upon program completion.	No	Yes: For initial lease-up, C.O. used, then with new occupant and at recert.
Family Scholar House	Stoddard Johnston Scholar House	57	2012	2012	Full portability upon program completion. 5-year term limit post graduation.	No	Yes: For initial lease-up, C.O. used. After initial move-in, with new occupant and at recert.
Family Scholar House	Parkland Scholar House + 5 off-site	53	2012 Amended	2012	Full portability upon program completion.	No	Yes: For initial lease-up, C.O. used, then with new occupant and at recert.
Day Spring	Day Spring constructed units	4	2009	2009, 2012*	Full portability.	Yes	No: Traditional inspection protocol.
Wellspring	Youngland Avenue	5	2012	2012	Full portability.	Yes	No: Traditional inspection protocol.
100K Homes Initiative	N/A	50	2012	2012	Full portability.	No	No: Traditional inspection protocol.
Wellspring	Bashford Manor/Newburg	8	2012	—	Full portability.	No	No: Traditional inspection protocol.
Coalition for the Homeless	N/A	20	2012	2013	Full portability.	No	No: Traditional inspection protocol.
Family Scholar House with Housing Partnership Inc.	York Towers	10	2013	—	Full portability.	No	No: Traditional inspection protocol.

*Referral program suspended during FY2010 and FY2011.

2.i. *Rent Reform Hardship Requests*

N/A. This activity does not include rent reform.

3. *Benchmarks Not Achieved*

N/A. No benchmarks were established in the FY 2014 Plan.

4. *Revised Metrics*

LMHA has replaced all locally-defined metrics with new, HUD-required Standard Metrics.

5. *Changes to Data Collection Methodology*

LMHA has replaced all locally-defined metrics with HUD-required Standard Metrics. Standard Metrics data for this activity will be collected from Emphasys; staff logs; agency financial records; and special referral program partner agencies, once a tracking protocol has been established.

ACTIVITY #2-1999: MTW Unit Inspection Protocol

1. *Plan Year Approved and Implemented*

Activity #2-1999 was proposed and implemented in FY 1999.

2. *Description and Impact*

Many of LMHA's partners' residential facilities are newly constructed or renovated. As such, LMHA has used MTW authority to allow the certificate of occupancy to suffice for the initial move-in inspection in lieu of a traditional HQS inspection. This substitution has saved the authority thousands of dollars since Louisville Scholar House first came online in 2008.

Unit inspections of facilities at LMHA's Section 8 certificate programs that are managed by organizations with which the Agency has had a long-term and outstanding relationship, are waived upon initial occupancy, and the agency has the authority to conduct inspections once per year concurrently. Section 8 certificate programs include YMCA SRO, Roberts Hall and St. Vincent de Paul, and Willow Place. This activity has significantly reduced costs to inspect the units "tied" to these programs. In FY 2014, LMHA used this authority to inspect the 41 YMCA SRO units concurrently.

The LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

CE #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 1998: Not available	\$976 (41 units * \$23.80)	\$1,005 (41 units * \$24.52)	Meets benchmark
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs; PHA financial records.				

CE #2: Staff Time Savings

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 1998: Not available	23.9 hours (41 units * 0.6 hours)	23.9 hours (41 units * 0.6 hours)	Meets benchmark
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs; PHA financial records.				

<i>Cost Effectiveness #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease).	Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity (percentage).	Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 1998: Not available	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	Not tracked	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
				Explanation to be provided.
Data Source(s): Staff logs.				

2.i. *Rent Reform Hardship Requests*

N/A. This activity does not include rent reform.

3. *Benchmarks Not Achieved*

N/A. All outcomes meet benchmark.

4. *Revised Metrics*

LMHA has replaced all locally-defined metrics with new, HUD-required Standard Metrics.

5. *Changes to Data Collection Methodology*

LMHA has replaced all locally-defined metrics with HUD-required Standard Metrics. Standard Metrics data for this activity is collected from Emphasys; staff logs; and agency financial records.

ACTIVITY #27-2011: Amend HCV Admissions Policy to Allow for Deduction of Child-Care Expenses in Determination of Eligibility

1. *Plan Year Approved and Implemented*

Activity #27-2011 was proposed and implemented in FY 2011.

2. *Description and Impact*

LMHA amended its HCV program admissions policy to allow for the deduction of verified ongoing child-care expenses from a working household's gross income when determining income eligibility. In order to qualify for the adjustment, the family must include a head of household and/or spouse with a demonstrated work history for a period of 12 months or longer.

The pool of potential families eligible for the child-care deduction is very small. No families received the deduction during FY 2014. However, because of the potential benefit to working families, the agency believes the activity merits continuation.

The LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

<i>SS #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average amount of Section 8 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars (decrease).	Average subsidy per household affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2010: N/A (No families affected by policy)	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	N/A (No families affected by policy)	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
	Average subsidy per household affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars) prior to implementation.	Expected average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars) as of 6/30/14.	Actual average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars) as of 6/30/14.	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records				

<i>CE #7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Rental revenue in dollars (increase).	Rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2010: N/A (No families affected by policy)	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	N/A (No families affected by policy)	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
	<i>Sum</i> of gross (net) annual rent revenue from households who received the deduction to determine eligibility.	Expected <i>sum</i> of gross (net) annual rent revenue from households who received the deduction to determine eligibility as of 6/30/14.	Actual <i>sum</i> of gross (net) annual rent revenue from households who received the deduction to determine eligibility as of 6/30/14.	Explanation to be provided.
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records				

2.i. Rent Reform Hardship Requests

N/A. This activity does not include rent reform.

3. Benchmarks Not Achieved

N/A. No benchmarks were established in the agency's FY 2014 Plan.

4. Revised Metrics

LMHA has replaced all locally-defined metrics with new, HUD-required Standard Metrics.

5. *Changes to Data Collection Methodology*

LMHA has replaced all locally-defined metrics with HUD-required Standard Metrics. Standard Metrics data for this activity is collected from Emphasys and agency financial records.

ACTIVITY #39-2014: HCV Program Rent Increase Limit

1. *Plan Year Approved and Implemented*

Activity #39-2014 was proposed and implemented in FY 2014.

2. *Description and Impact*

This activity is a 2% cap on annual contract rent increases for units where the tenant is receiving HCV rental assistance. At contract renewals, LMHA will conduct rent comparables and limit the landlord's requested rent increase to 2% of the previous contract rent for the same tenant or HUD's fair market rent, whichever is less.

LMHA has not yet developed a mechanism to track the impact of this activity, but plans to do so in FY 2016.

The LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

<i>SS #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average amount of Section 8 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars (decrease).	Average subsidy per household affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2010: N/A (No families affected by policy)	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	N/A (No families affected by policy)	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
	Average subsidy per household affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars) prior to implementation.	Expected average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars) as of 6/30/14.	Actual average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars) as of 6/30/14.	Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records				

<i>Cost Effectiveness #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Rental revenue in dollars (increase).	Rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2010: N/A (No families affected by policy)	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan	N/A (No families affected by policy)	N/A. Metric not included in FY2014 Plan
	<i>Sum</i> of gross (net) annual rental revenue from	Expected <i>sum</i> of gross annual rental revenue from households affected	Actual <i>sum</i> of gross rental revenue from households affected by	Explanation to be provided

	households affected by this policy	by this policy between 7/1/13 and 6/30/14	this policy between 7/1/13 and 6/30/14	
Data Source(s): Emphasys; PHA financial records				

2.i. Rent Reform Hardship Requests

N/A. This activity does not include rent reform.

3. Benchmarks Not Achieved

N/A. No benchmarks were established in the agency's FY 2014 Plan.

4. Revised Metrics

LMHA has replaced all locally-defined metrics with new, HUD-required Standard Metrics.

5. Changes to Data Collection Methodology

LMHA has replaced all locally-defined metrics with HUD-required Standard Metrics. Standard Metrics data for this activity is collected from Emphasys and agency financial records.

A.7 Local, Non-Traditional Housing Programs

ACTIVITY #37-2014: Accessible Units Sublease Agreement with Frazier Rehab Institute

1. *Plan Year Approved and Implemented*

Activity #39-2014 was proposed and implemented in FY 2014.

2. *Description and Impact*

The activity allows LMHA to sublease fully accessible units as temporary housing for Spinal Cord Injury (SCI) out-patients of Frazier Rehab Institute. The units are transitional housing provided for up to six months per family. Frazier Rehab Institute is responsible for verifying that the family is eligible to live in the unit (e.g., a program participant, household income is at or below 80% AMI). Two fully-accessible units located at the Liberty Green Community Center are dedicated to this activity. The Community Center is ideally located one-half mile from the Frazier Rehab Institute. Frazier Rehab leases the apartments from LMHA and pay the cost of all utilities. Rent to Frazier Rehab is set at \$210 per month (or roughly 30% of monthly SSI for one person), and Frazier Rehab has agreed to pass on no more than 100% of the rent plus utilities to the tenant (the sublessee). Frazier Rehab uses a modified version of LMHA's public housing lease as its tenant sublease and has established a hardship policy to define circumstances under which households may be exempted or temporarily waived from the rent Frazier Rehab may charge to the sublessee. Examples could include involuntary loss of income or unexpected medical expenses. Frazier Rehab also refers sublessees to area service providers, including the Center for Accessible Living (Kentucky's first Independent Living Center), who can assist households with leaving the program.

Often, the only housing option for SCI patients is a room at one of the extended stay hotels located at the edge of the city. A room can cost the patient and their family hundreds of dollars per week in addition to any travel costs they may have incurred coming to Louisville for treatment. For low-income families needing treatment, securing and paying for housing can be a great burden. Through this unique partnership, LMHA increases housing options for these families. In addition, the activity achieves greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures. LMHA had been experiencing difficulty leasing the two fully-accessible apartments to applicants on the public housing waitlist; consequently the units had been vacant. Under this activity, Frazier Rehab subleases the units to out-patients of the program and pays LMHA \$210 per month for each unit, increasing the number of families served and rental revenue for the agency.

In FY 2014, LMHA served 5 households through this activity.

The LMHA tracks the following HUD Standard Metrics for this activity:

CE #2: Staff Time Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2013: N/A	12 hours	10 hours	Benchmark not met See section 3 below for explanation
				Explanation to be

				provided
Data Source(s): Emphasys; Staff logs; PHA financial records				

<i>Housing Choice #1: Additional Units of Housing Made Available</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of new housing units made available for households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity (increase). If units reach a specific type of household, give that type in this box.	Housing units of this type prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected housing units of this type after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual housing units of this type after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	As of FY 2013: 0	2	2	Meets benchmark
				Explanation to be provided
Data Source(s): PIC				

2.i. Rent Reform Hardship Requests

N/A. This activity does not include rent reform.

3. Benchmarks Not Achieved

CE #2: Staff Time Savings

LMHA anticipated that 12 staff hours would be saved through this activity during FY 2014. Instead, 10 staff hours were saved. The agency served one fewer household than expected during the year (5 instead of 6), resulting in 2 fewer hours of staff time savings.

4. Revised Metrics

LMHA has replaced all locally-defined metrics with new, HUD-required Standard Metrics.

5. Changes to Data Collection Methodology

LMHA has replaced all locally-defined metrics with HUD-required Standard Metrics. Standard Metrics data for this activity is collected from Emphasys; PIC; staff logs; and agency financial records.

B. Not Yet Implemented MTW Activities

For each not yet implemented activity, LMHA has provided:

- 1) The Plan Year in which the activity was first approved;
- 2) A description of the activity and an update on its status; and
- 3) Discussion of any actions taken toward implementation during the fiscal year.

ACTIVITY #40-2014: Financial Aid Disregard in Calculation of TTP – HCV Program

1. Plan Year Approved and Implemented

Activity #40-2014 was proposed and approved in FY 2014. It has not yet been implemented.

2. Description and Status Update

When calculating an HCV participant's Total Tenant Payment, this activity allows LMHA to disregard financial aid exceeding amounts received for tuition for all households regardless of age or family status where the head of household is a student.

This activity encourages families, in particular those families with children whose head of household is 23 or younger, to become self-sufficient. Under current HCV program rules (Federal Register 12-30-05), financial aid paid to a student over the age of 23 with dependent children is excluded. LMHA has extended this benefit to all students.

3. Actions Toward Implementation

The agency is currently in the process of making the required updates to its HCV Administrative Plan, and plans to implement the activity during FY 2016.

ACTIVITY #28-2011: Locally Defined Guidelines for Development, Maintenance and Modernization of Public Housing

1. Plan Year Approved and Implemented

Activity #28-2011 was proposed and approved in FY 2011. It has not yet been implemented.

2. Description and Status Update

The activity is to explore using MTW authority to create locally defined guidelines for the development (including rehabilitation), maintenance and modernization of public housing. LMHA is currently in the process of researching and establishing reasonable and modest design guidelines, unit size guidelines and unit amenity guidelines that could be used for new public housing development activities. LMHA is also investigating how to incorporate green maintenance practices in addition to environmentally friendly and energy efficient design standards.

3. Actions Toward Implementation

The agency is investigating how it might use locally defined guidelines to inform plans for the public housing units at Beecher Terrace, one of the largest HUD-assisted developments within the Russell Neighborhood Choice Initiative target area. If and when new guidelines are drafted, they will be submitted for HUD approval.

C. MTW Activities On-Hold

For each activity on-hold, LMHA has provided:

- 1) The Plan Year in which the activity was first approved, implemented and placed on-hold;
- 2) A description of the activity and an update on its status; and
- 3) Report on any actions that were taken towards reactivating the activity.

ACTIVITY #25-2010: Public Housing Sublease Agreement with Catholic Charities

1. *Plan Year Approved, Implemented, and Placed On-Hold*

Activity #25-2010 was proposed and implemented in FY 2010. The activity was placed on-hold in 2012.

2. *Description and Status*

HUD OGC investigated the use of public housing as emergency housing for victims of human trafficking and found that it was not feasible under MTW to permit families who could not produce valid identification to live in public housing communities.

3. *Actions Taken Towards Reactivation*

This activity will remain on hold until a resolution, allowing victims of human trafficking to receive much-needed housing assistance, can be reached.

D. Closed Out MTW Activities

For closed out activity, LMHA has provided:

- 1) The Plan Year in which the activity was first approved and implemented (if applicable) and a description of the activity;
- 2) The year the activity was closed out; and
- 3) In the year the activity was closed out,
 - a. Discussion of the final outcome and lessons learned
 - b. Description of any statutory exceptions outside of the current MTW flexibilities that might have provided additional benefit for this activity
 - c. Summary table, listing outcomes from each year of the activity (since the execution of the Standard MTW Agreement); and
 - d. Narrative for additional explanations about outcomes reported in the summary table.

ACTIVITY #24-2010: Increased Flat Rents

1. *Plan Year Approved and Implemented; Activity Description*

LMHA proposed this initiative in the 2010 Annual Plan, and it was approved by HUD that year. LMHA proposed flat rents for the Agency's scattered sites be raised and adjusted based on the square footage, location, age and amenities at the property as rent comparables for the site were completed. LMHA decided not to implement this activity, and flat rents have since been raised across all of the agency's public housing units to meet HUD's recent requirement that PHAs set flat rents to at least 80% of FMR.

2. *Plan Year Closed Out*

The activity was closed-out FYE 2011.

3. *In the year the activity was closed out provide the following:*

i. *Final outcomes and lessons learned*

This activity was never implemented.

ii. *Statutory exceptions outside of MTW that would have provided additional benefit*

Unknown.

iii. *Summary table of outcomes from each year of the activity*

Not applicable.

iv. *Narrative for additional explanations about outcomes reported above.*

Not applicable.

ACTIVITY #5-2007: Spatial Deconstruction of HCV Assisted Units

1. *Plan Year Approved and Implemented; Activity Description*

LMHA proposed this initiative in the 2007 Annual Plan, and it was approved by HUD that year. The activity was to limit the concentration of Housing Choice Voucher assisted units in complexes of one hundred or more units to 25% (excluding both elderly/disabled and special referral program sites). The goals of the activity were two-fold: to increase the number of communities in exception rent areas where voucher holders live, and to decrease the number of assisted units in large properties that already exceeded the 25% cap.

2. *Plan Year Closed Out*

This activity was closed-out at fiscal yearend 2009.

3. *In the year the activity was closed out provide the following:*

i. *Final outcomes and lessons learned*

LMHA was ultimately concerned that the activity would limit housing choices for low-income families. As documented in the 2009 year-end report, the activity did not reduce the number of large developments that failed to meet the spatial deconcentration goals. However, from 2006 to 2009, the number of assisted units in underutilized exception rent areas did increase. Regardless, had the 25% cap remained in place, the policy might have limited a family's choice to move to a certain community if it had a higher percentage of voucher holders.

ii. *Statutory exceptions outside of MTW that would have provided additional benefit*

None.

iii. *Summary table of outcomes from each year of the activity*

See table below from FY 2009 Annual Report.

**TABLE 10.1 Spatial Deconcentration of HCV Assisted Units
Benchmark vs. Actual FY 09**

Site-no. units	FY 06 Baseline	FY 07 Actual	FY 08 Actual	FY 09 Bmk	FY 09 Actual
A-130 units	106 (81.5%)	98 (75.4%)	107 (82.3%)	</=25%	106 (81.5%)
B-167 units	61 (36.5%)	68 (40.7%)	61 (36.5%)	</=25%	75 (44.9%)
C-161 units	24 (14.9%)	21 (13%)	19 (11.8%)	</=25%	23 (14.3%)
D-124 units	30 (24.2%)	17 (13.7%)	15 (12.1%)	</=25%	15 (12.1%)
E-150 units	47 (31.3%)	44 (29.3%)	46 (30.67%)	</=25%	45 (30%)
F-170 units	15 (8.8%)	13 (7.6%)	37 (21.8%)	</=25%	38 (22.3%)
G-400 units	50 (9.5%)	27 (6.7%)	22 (5.5%)	</=25%	14 (3.5%)
H-260 units	14 (5.4%)	25 (9.6%)	32 (12.3%)	</=25%	41 (15.8%)

**TABLE 10.2 HCV Units in Exception Payment Areas
Benchmark vs. Actual FY 2009**

Census Tract	FY 06 Baseline	FY 07 Actual	FY 08 Actual	FY 09 Bmk	FY 09 Actual
75	0	1	1	+ unit	1
76	0	3	3	+ unit	4
98	1	0	0	+ unit	3
100	33	52	54	-	63
101	12	9	10	+ unit	11
103	21	31	33	-	36
104	5	17	66	-	65
105	1	0	0	+ unit	0
106	2	4	4	+ unit	6
107	1	0	0	+ unit	0
108	9	11	12	-	12
111	114	130	136	-	135
114	9	9	9	+ unit	8
115	6	8	8	+ unit	16
117	2	5	5	+ unit	5
120	15	18	17	-	21
121	52	81	96	-	114
124	34	36	49	-	54
131	3	1	1	+ unit	0
Total	320	416	504	50 more units	554
no. of underutilized census tracts w/ exception payment areas	12	11	10	less 1 census tract	9
no. of underutilized exception payment areas	26	24	23	less 1 area	22

Notes

Underutilized is defined as 10 or fewer units.

iv. Narrative for additional explanations about outcomes reported above.
None.

ACTIVITY #33-2012: Rents Set at 30% of Adjusted Income – Public Housing Program

1. Plan Year Approved and Implemented; Activity Description

Proposed and approved in the FY 2012 Plan, LMHA proposed that families receiving rental assistance under the Public Housing program would pay either 30% of their monthly adjusted income for rent, or the minimum rent established by the LMHA, whichever was higher. Upon further consideration, because the Housing Authority's housing stock includes tax credit units, LMHA considered amending the activity to include "ceiling rents" that would vary by bedroom size and that would be set in accordance with the annual tax-credit ceiling rents, as published by the Kentucky Housing Corporation (KHC). KHC is the tax credit allocating agency for the Commonwealth of Kentucky. The proposal to change was never submitted to HUD, however. Rather, in 2014, LMHA raised flat rents to conform to new HUD regulations mandating that PHAs set flat rents to at least 80% of FMR.

2. Plan Year Closed Out

The activity was officially closed-out fiscal year-end 2014.

3. In the year the activity was closed out provide the following:

i. Final outcomes and lessons learned

In 2014, LMHA decided not to pursue this activity in response to newly-issued HUD regulations that require PHAs to set flat rents to at least 80% of FMR.. As a result of the new rule, the agency raised flat rates significantly across the entire public housing stock. LMHA anticipates that higher flat rents will achieve the goals of the proposed activity within HUD's existing regulatory framework.

ii. Statutory exceptions outside of MTW that would have provided additional benefit

None.

iii. Summary table of outcomes from each year of the activity

This activity was not implemented.

iv. Narrative for additional explanations about outcomes reported above.

Not applicable.

ACTIVITY #16-2009: Explore HUD's Streamlined Demolition and Disposition Application Process for MTW Agencies

1. Plan Year Approved and Implemented; Activity Description

Proposed and approved in the FY 2009 Plan, this activity was never implemented. HUD investigated the possibility of streamlined demolition/disposition activities for MTW agencies but found that it was not feasible under MTW. Out of concern for residents' rights and the public process, HUD decided that MTW agencies must follow the established procedures for demolition and disposition of property.

2. Plan Year Closed Out

This activity was officially closed-out FYE 2014.

3. In the year the activity was closed out provide the following:

i. Final outcomes and lessons learned

This activity was never implemented.

ii. Statutory exceptions outside of MTW that would have provided additional benefit

Unknown.

iii. Summary table of outcomes from each year of the activity

Not applicable.

iv. Narrative for additional explanations about outcomes reported above.

None.

V. Sources and Uses of Funds

Generally: A pre-formatted Microsoft Excel table has been provided for PHAs to report the required information in this section. PHAs will copy and paste the HUD-provided Microsoft Excel tables into the body of Section (V) in their Plan/Report. With the initial submittal of the Plan/Report to HUD, the PHA will also include the completed, separate Microsoft Excel file. A PHA may include additional information regarding sources and uses of funding as an appendix to the Plan/Report. The PHA may reference such an appendix in Section (V) of the Plan/Report to direct readers to this information.

Annual MTW Report (FYE 6/30/14)
V.3.Report.Sources and Uses of MTW Funds
A. MTW Report: Sources and Uses of MTW Funds
Actual Sources and Uses of MTW Funding for the Fiscal Year
PHAs shall submit their unaudited and audited information in the prescribed FDS format through the Financial Assessment System - PHA (FASPHA), or its successor system
Describe the Activities that Used Only MTW Single Fund Flexibility
<p>Louisville Metro Housing Authority (LMHA) used the single fund flexibility authorized in the MTW Program to transfer approx. \$771,000 from the Housing Choice Voucher Program and approx. \$4,824,000 from the Capital Fund Program (CFP) to the Public Housing Program. These transfers exceeded budgeted levels, but were necessary for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Operating subsidy for the Public Housing Program was funded at 82% of eligibility for 2013, and at 89% of eligibility for 2014 (six months of each calendar year affects LMHA's fiscal year ending June 30, 2014).2. LMHA attempts to manage all of its public housing AMPs at a high level and maintain a balanced operating budget at each. The HUD approved project expense levels (PEL) for most AMPs do not adequately provide for management services at the level deemed necessary by LMHA.3. The local HUD office instructed LMHA to move contract security costs and resident stipend payments from the CFP to the AMP's operating budgets as the result of the new CFP rule issued in October, 2013. LMHA incurs significant security costs while attempting to protect our elderly and disabled residents.4. Utility expenses significantly exceeded budget due to a bitter cold winter (December 2013 through February 2014). Utility rates increased as well. <p>Although LMHA utilizes the funding flexibility available in the MTW Program, LMHA adheres to all statutes and regulations relative to HUD's asset management program. All budgeting and reporting within the Public Housing Program is done on an individual site basis, and LMHA utilizes a "fee for service" methodology that charges the sites only for the services they receive.</p> <p>LMHA continues to employ a Multi-Cultural Specialist as originally approved in ongoing Activity #17-2009.</p>

V.4.Report.Local Asset Management Plan									
B. MTW Report: Local Asset Management Plan									
Has the PHA allocated costs within statute during the plan year?	<input type="text" value="Yes"/>	<input type="text"/>							
Has the PHA implemented a local asset management plan (LAMP)?	<input type="text"/>	or	<input type="text" value="No"/>						
<p>If the PHA is implementing a LAMP, it shall be described in an appendix every year beginning with the year it is proposed and approved. It shall explain the deviations from existing HUD requirements and should be updated if any changes are made to the LAMP.</p>									
Has the PHA provided a LAMP in the appendix?	<input type="text"/>	or	<input type="text" value="No"/>						
<p style="text-align: center;">In the body of the Report, PHAs should provide a narrative updating the progress of implementing and operating the Local Asset Management Plan during the fiscal year.</p>									

V.5.Report.Unspent MTW Funds									
C. MTW Report: Commitment of Unspent Funds									
<p>In the table below, provide planned commitments or obligations of unspent MTW funds at the end of the PHA's fiscal year.</p>									
	Account	Planned Expenditure	Obligated Funds	Committed Funds					
	Type	No current planned commitments or obligations.	\$ X	\$ X					
	Type	Description	\$ X	\$ X					
	Type	Description	\$ X	\$ X					
	Type	Description	\$ X	\$ X					
	Type	Description	\$ X	\$ X					
	Type	Description	\$ X	\$ X					
	Type	Description	\$ X	\$ X					
	Type	Description	\$ X	\$ X					
	Total Obligated or Committed Funds:		-	-					
<p>In the body of the Report, PHAs shall provide, in as much detail as possible, an explanation of plans for future uses of unspent funds, including what funds have been obligated or committed to specific projects.</p>									
<p>Note : Written notice of a definition of MTW reserves will be forthcoming. Until HUD issues a methodology for defining reserves, including a definition of obligations and commitments, MTW agencies are not required to complete this section.</p>									

VI. Administrative

A. Description of progress on the correction or elimination of observed deficiencies cited in monitoring visits, physical inspections, or other oversight and monitoring mechanisms, if applicable;

The former Housing Authority of Louisville was rated a high performer under Public Housing Assessment System (PHAS) and Section Eight Management Assessment Program (SEMAP) for FY 1998 and LMHA retains this score throughout the Moving to Work demonstration.

B. Agency Directed Evaluations of Moving To Work Program

The Louisville Metro Housing Authority did not conduct an evaluation of the Authority's Moving To Work Demonstration Program during fiscal year 2014.

D. Certification that the Agency has met the three statutory requirements

See certification on the following page.

Certification of Meeting MTW Statutory Requirements

Applicant Name

LOUISVILLE METRO HOUSING AUTHORITY

Program/Activity Receiving Federal Funding

MOVING TO WORK DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

Acting on behalf of the above named Applicant as its Authorized Official, I make the following certifications and agreements to the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD):

I certify that the above named Applicant has met the statutory requirements of the Moving to Work Demonstration Program (MTW) of:

1. Assuring that at least 75 percent of the families assisted by the Agency are very low-income families;
2. Continuing to assist substantially the same number of families as would have been served had the amounts not been combined; and
3. Maintaining a comparable mix of families (by family size) are served, as would have been provided had the amounts not been used under the demonstration.

I hereby certify that all the information stated herein is true and accurate.


Name of Authorized Official

TIM BARRY

Title

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Signature



Date (mm/dd/yyyy)

6/12/15